nw
971.51
B862
cop 2

V. R.

# The Government Gazette Extraordinary.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA.

VICTORIA, B. C., MARCH, 1870.

## Legislative Council.

### DEBATE ON THE SUBJECT OF CONFEDERATION WITH CANADA.

WEDNESDAY, 9TH MARCH, 1870.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL CREASE opened the debate on Confederation, as follows:—

Mr. President,—I rise to move that this Council do now resolve itself into Committee of the whole, to take into consideration the terms proposed for the Confederation of the Colony of British Columbia with the Dominion of Canada, in His Excellency's Message to this Council.

In doing so, I am deeply impressed with the momentous character of the discussion into which we are about to enter, the grave importance of a decision by which the fate of this our adopted country of British Columbia must be influenced, for better, for worse, for all time to come. And I earnestly hope that our minds and best energies may be bent to a task which will tax all our patriotism, all our forbearance, all our abnegation of self, and selfish aims, to combine all our individual powers into one great, united effort for the common good.

May He who holds the fate of Nations in the hollow of His hand, and crowns with success, or brings to naught, the counsels of men, guide all our deliberations to such an issue as shall promote the peace, honour, and welfare of our Most Gracious Sovereign, and of this and all other portions of Her extended realm.

And now, Mr. President, I must dwell a few moments on the exact practical import of the motion before the House, and the issue which is involved in the "Aye" or "No" which each Honourable Member will be called upon to cast upon the question which you, Mr. President, will put to the House in that familiar Parliamentary phrase "That I do now leave the Chair?"

This issue is, Confederation or no Confederation?

The motion assumes that the principle of Confederation has been already fully adopted by this House—and having so assumed, asks you now to go into Committee of the whole to discuss the Terms on which the Colony would be content to be confederated with the Dominion.

Your question, therefore, Mr. President, "That I do now leave the Chair?" means—Will you refuse Confederation at any price? or Will you have it on favourable terms? That is the issue before us now.

Now, therefore, is the time for those Honourable Members who, notwithstanding the previous Resolutions of this House so frequently affirming the principle, ["No, No," from Dr. Helmcken] still conscientiously object to the principles of Confederation, to come forward and explain to this Honourably body, and to the country at large, their views,—why they still refuse to aid in the consolidation of British interests on the North American Continent, by the Confederation of this Colony with the Dominion, and the creation of one homogeneous nationality from sea to sea.

Some Honourable gentlemen say "No, No" to my statement that the House has affirmed the principle of Confederation. But I appeal to the Journals of this House, in proof of what I state. I well remember, on the 19th March, 1867, when the "British North America Act, 1867," was being framed by the Imperial Parliament, this Council, anxious to be embraced within the purview of its provisions, passed by an unanimous vote the following Resolution:—

"*Resolved*, That this Council is of opinion that at this juncture of affairs in British North America, east of the Rocky Mountains, it is very desirable that His Excellency be respectfully requested to take such steps, without delay, as may be deemed by him best adapted to insure the admission of British Columbia into the Confederation on fair and equitable terms, this Council being confident that in advising this step they are expressing the views of the Colonists generally."

And more than that, this Resolution was followed up by a deputation of individual members to Governor Seymour, who at their instance telegraphed to the Secretary of State the purport of that Resolution; and on the 22nd March, the following Message was sent down to the Council on the subject:—

"The Governor has received the Resolution of the Legislative Council, dated the 19th instant, in favour of the admission of British Columbia with the proposed Confederation of the Eastern British Colonies of North America. He will place himself in communication on the subject with the Secretary of State, with Viscount Monck, Governor General of Canada, and with Sir Edmund Head, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company."

Whatever construction may be put upon this Resolution by Honourable Members who have said "No, No," one thing is certain, it affirmed, in the most distinct manner, by this Council *the principle of Confederation*, the advisability of our joining at sometime or other the Dominion of Canada. That principle has during every subsequent session, down to the present day, been confirmed, either directly or indirectly, by a specific Resolution of this House ["No, no," from Dr. Helmcken and Mr. Wood]. Thus, on the 28th

April, 1868, a Resolution was passed by [illegible] confirming the previous Resolution, in the following terms:—

"That this Council, while *confirming the vote of last Session in favour of the general principle* of the desirability of the Union of this Colony with the Dominion of Canada, to accomplish the consolidation of British interests and institutions in North America, are still without sufficient information and experience of the practical working of Confederation in the North American Provinces, to admit of their defining the terms on which such an Union would be advantageous to the local interests of British Columbia."

What is that but a confirmation of the principle? Now let us look to the Journals of 1869. There I see that, on the 17th February, 1869, when owing to the position of other political issues then current in the Colony, it would have been easy, had it been so desired, to procure an adverse verdict on the principle of Confederation, the House, though invited to do so, refused to go any further than to request Her Majesty's Government (while the North-West Territory was still out of the Dominion) not to press the *present* consummation of Union. The word "present" was an express amendment of my Honourable colleague opposite (Mr. Trutch) and myself, so as to preserve the principle, and bide our time. The House, therefore, I take it, has thoroughly and uniformly committed itself to the principle of Confederation, and may very properly be invited now, setting aside all causes of difference, for the common good, calmly, frankly, and cordially to enter upon a discussion of the terms. But if any Honourable Members think the principle has not been decided, now is the time and now the hour to settle that point (as far as this Session and this present Council is concerned) once and forever. They are bound, in support of their views, to lay before the Council the reasons for the faith that is in them, and to explain why we should not consolidate counsels with the Dominion.

And here, Mr. President, let me say a few words upon the position the Official Members of this Council have occupied throughout the whole of this matter.

Their action has been much misunderstood—I will not say misconstrued—both in England and at Ottawa.

Until the receipt of Earl Granville's Confederation Despatch of 14th August, 1869, they did not feel themselves at liberty to go further in the direction of Confederation than to affirm the general principle of its propriety, carefully abstaining from the expression of opinion on the merits of any prticular mode, details, or time of carrying that principle into practical effect

That, they considered, could most effectually be done by Her Majesty's Government, an Executive peculiarly qualified for the task, this Legislature, and the People of this Colony all acting in concert together, as it is now proposed to do.

I do not at present intend to enter into the details of what particular terms would or would not be most advantageous to this Country in any proposal for Confederation.

That will be a question for the House to settle when, if ever, we get into Committee on the subject; but, inasmuch, as the principle of Confederation means the advisability of consolidating British interests on the North American Continent, it is impossible to lose sight altogether, in a debate upon the principle, of the general advantages to be derived by British Columbia from a participation in that great scheme.

I readily confess that there are drawbacks to material union, such as distance, lack of communication, and, to some extent, want of identity of interest, which can only—but yet which can—be removed either wholly, or in a very great degree, by suitable conditions of Union.

It is for us to determine those conditions in this House, and after negotiation upon them with Canada, to submit them to the decision of the popular vote, the people being the parties principally affected by the change, who will have to pass in the last resort, once and for ever, upon the whole question.

The circumstances, political, geographical, and social, under which we are at present placed, compel us to political movement in one direction or another, and the question is now—In what direction shall we go?

We are sandwiched between United States Territory to the north and south—indeed on all sides but one, and that one opening towards Canada. Our only option is between remaining a petty, isolated community 15,000 miles from home, ekeing out a miserable existence on the crumbs of prosperity our powerful and active republican neighbours choose to allow us, or, by taking our place among the comity of nations, become the prosperous western outlet on the North Pacific of a young and vigorous people, the eastern boundary of whose possessions is washed by the Atlantic.

This is the only option left to faithful subjects of the British Crown.

Now look at our condition as a Colony, with a climate far finer than any other in the world, with magnificent harbours, rivers, seas, and waters for inland navigation, with unrivalled resources of almost every description you can name—coal, lumber, spars, fish, and furs—mines of gold, silver, copper, lead cinnabar, tin, and almost every other mineral throughout the land; with a soil and climate admirably adapted to pastoral and agricultural pursuits—with almost every natural advantage which the lavish hand of nature can bestow upon a country—the undoubted fact remains:

We are not prosperous.

Population does not increase.

Trade and Commerce languish; coal mining does not advance; agriculture, though progressive, does not go forward as it might.

The settlement of the country, though increasing, yet falls short of just expectations.

No public works for opening the country are on hand, and a general lack of progress (that is, proportioned to the extraordinary resources of the Colony) is everywhere apparent.

And why is this?

It is not, as some allege, because of the particular form of Government we at present enjoy (if it were, Confederation in that would effect a change).

It is among other things a Public debt altogether disproportioned to our means.

Our close proximity to an active and powerful neighbour whose interests are foreign to our own. ["Hear, Hear," from Dr. Helmcken]. But the chief reason of all is that policy of isolation which has kept us aloof from the assistance and sympathy of a kindred race, and left us in the infant state of one of England's youngest Colonies, to support the burdens and responsibilities of a thickly peopled and long settled land.

Do Hon. Members ask what would Confederation do for us?

It would at once relieve us from the most if not all the present ills from which we suffer, if properly arranged.

For Confederation in some sense means terms. It would assume our Public Debt.

Greatly increase our Public Credit, and thereby aid in the utilization of our varied resources.

It would leave us a *good balance* in our Exchequer to carry on all local works and open out the country.

It would give us a Railroad across the Continent, and a quick and easy access to Ottawa, New York, and London.

It would cement and strengthen, instead of weaken, our connection with the Mother-land, and ensure the protection of her Fleet and Army.

It would attract population, ever tending in a continuous wave towards the West.

It would promote the settlement of our Public Lands, and the development of Agriculture.

Under it Trade and Commerce would take a fresh start. It would enlarge, not contract our political horizon, and it would infuse new hope and life blood into the whole system of the Colony, and not leave us a mere detached Municipality, as some suppose, any more than Scotland is separate from the rest of Great Britain, or the County of Kent from England.

I leave to others to dilate upon the advantages which Canada would derive from the connection, the possession of a Far West (Canada's great want) into which her rapidly increasing population may pour, instead of going to swell the bulk of the adjoining States.

Those gentlemen will be able to show that the ultimate importance—nay possible existence—of the Dominion as a Nation may hereafter, in some measure, depend upon her Union with ourselves.

To them, also, I leave the task of dwelling on the healing of old internal feuds of race and language of which Confederation is the only cure.

If we watch the progress of events, they all point to the same end, to the growth of a new universal sentiment of nationality in British America.

It is clear that events all gravitate in that direction.

[Mr. De Cosmos "In the direction of Confederation or Nationality?"]

I say Sir, that the current of events points to Confederation and ultimately to Nationality.

Confederation is evidently our ultimate destiny—Our own interests—Canadian aspirations—and Imperial policy, as enunciated in the Secretary of State's Despatch, all point the same way.

We shall, therefore, best consult the real interests of the Colony, the sooner bring on a new era of progress and prosperity in this favoured land, by not delaying to debate and consider over the advisability of the principle itself, but at once to go into Committee of the Whole, and there combine all our energies upon the best scheme to be submitted in the last resort to the decision of the people, for carrying out the principle of Confederation, under God's blessing, successfully into practical effect.

The motion was seconded by the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, who was excused from speaking at this stage of the debate on the ground of indisposition, under which he was manifestly suffering.

The Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN said, the subject of Confederation was introduced by His Excellency the Governor in his Speech, in the following terms:—

"The community is already acquainted with the Despatch which I have recently received from Her Majesty's Secretary of State on this subject; and the careful consideration of it cannot longer be deferred with courtesy to Her Majesty's Government, or advantage to the Colony. I commend it to your earnest thought. For my own part I am convinced that on certain terms, which I believe it would not be difficult to arrange, this Colony may derive substantial benefit from such an Union. But the only manner in which it can be ascertained whether Canada will agree to such arrangements as will suit us, is to propose such as we would be ready to accept. With the assistance of my Council, I have prepared a scheme which I shall cause to be laid before you. Resolutions framed upon that basis will enable me to communicate with the Government of Canada and ascertain whether they will be willing to accede to our propositions.

While the views of Her Majesty's Government have been clearly and forcibly expressed upon this question, I am sure there is no desire to urge the Union except in accordance with its general acceptance by British subjects in the Colony. I do not, therefore, propose that any terms agreed upon by the Government of Canada should be finally accepted, until ratified by the general verdict of the community, so far as that can be ascertained through another Council, of which the Unofficial Members shall have been re-elected."

Before proceeding to the consideration of the subject, I will reply in a very few words to the speech of the Hon. Attorney General. The Hon. gentleman laid great stress upon the consolidation of British interests on this Coast, but I say, Sir, that however much we are in favour of consolidating British interests, our own interests must come first, Imperial interests can well afford to wait. We are invited to settle this question now and for ever, but I say that we are not called upon to do so; the matter will come before the people after the proposed terms have been submitted to the Dominion Government, and it will very likely happen that, if these terms are rejected and others of a mean nature substituted by the Government of Canada for the consideration of the people of this Colony, other issues may come up at the polls, and amongst them, the question whether there is no other place to which this Colony can go but Canada; whatever may be the result of the present vote, it is impossible to deny the probability of the less being absorbed by the greater; and it cannot be regarded as improbable that ultimately, not only this Colony, but the whole of the Dominion of Canada will be absorbed by the United States. The Hon. Attorney General has not attempted to prove the advantages which will result from Confederation, he has contented himself with vague assertions of advantages.

The question is only brought down by the Governor in consequence of the Despatch of Lord Granville; all we have to do is to agree to a series of Resolutions. It is not pretended that it is the voice of the people, or the voice of this Council. It is well understood that it is a Government measure. And we all know what that means—it means that this series of Resolutions is to be passed—And we have it from the Governor that he desires to send these Resolutions to Canada; they will not go, they are not intended to go, as the opinion of the people, but when certain terms have been agreed upon between the Government of this Colony and the Dominion Parliament, they will come back to the people for ratification. It remains then for the people to organise, so as to be ready at the proper time to give their verdict, for the responsibilities will ultimately rest with the people, and it is for them to say whether they will have Confederation or not.

I do think, Sir, that the question ought to have been an open one.

Her Majesty's Government ought not to have interfered, they are not justified in interfering in business which we could very well manage for ourselves.

I feel certain that His Excellency will act uprightly, fairly, honestly, and generously, by, and for, the Colony [hear, hear]; and, Sir, I fully believe that if these terms are declined now, in any future negotiations that may take place, if the people support the Governor, no terms will be accepted, or ever proposed, which would lead to this Colony being sacrificed to Canada, and that the people will have every opportunity afforded them to organise for the final vote when the time arrives for the settlement of this question "finally and forever," as the Honourable Gentleman has put it.

I see no reason, Sir, why Her Majesty's Government should interfere with our affairs, there is no reason that the Members of this Council should be coerced.

The desire of Her Majesty's Government is in reality a command to the Executive.

A new Election ought to have been called before this question was brought on; but there is one satisfaction left us, it is that Her Majesty's Government have left the terms to the Colony.

It is for the people to use that power rightly, wisely, and well, to see that Confederation means the welfare and progress of the Colony.

Now, Sir, in the first place, it is necessary for the people to see that Confederation must be for the general good of the Colony.

I am opposed to this question being brought down now.

I believe it to be most inopportune. It is believed by most people that this Colony is on the verge of great changes. That the new gold discoveries will bring a large population to this Colony, and that the slight despondency which now exists will be swept away, and that this Colony will once more enter upon an era of prosperity not inferior to that which belonged to it a few years ago.

I say, Sir, that this is an inopportune period to bring this question up, because when that population which is expected arrives, our position to negotiate for terms will be much better, because with a larger population and greater prosperity, we may demand far better terms than now, and, Sir, it is my firm conviction that if prosperity comes shortly the people of this Colony will not desire to change certainty for uncertainty.

Another reason there is that we ought to wait until after 1871; in that year Canada has to take a census of the population, and when that is taken we shall know the amount of the debt per head. I have no doubt it is greater now than when Confederation was first inaugurated. It is increasing, and I believe that instead of 22 cents per head it will now be 25 cents.

I should like, then, to wait until after 1871, because we shall then have a better opportunity of knowing the financial condition of those with whom we would connect ourselves.

It is inopportune, also, for the reason that the present difficulties in the Red River Settlement are sufficient to cause us great anxiety. I will not take up the time of this House by inquiring whether the people of that Territory are right or wrong. I know not, and shall not discuss the question: but this I do know, that if they induce the Indians to join them it will cause a great delay in the settlement of that country; and we do not even yet know that the Red River Settlement will prove so inviting to emigration as is reported. Again, Sir, I may state that Confederation, so far as it has at present gone, is but a mere experiment. It is nothing more or less than an experiment. And I believe that considerable dissatisfaction has resulted from it. If we wait a little longer before seeking to enter within its pale ourselves, we shall know better about the faults of its machinery, and perhaps be able to learn what are its drawbacks, and how we can best avoid them. These, Sir, are good and sufficient reasons for delay. It is absurd to attempt to ally ourselves with a people 10 miles away, without any settlement of the intervening country, with no communication except through the United States, and with no telegraphic communication. Canada is for all practical purposes further removed from us to-day than England, we know less about her. When we asked for a copy of the Canadian Tariff we were told that there was no copy to be had. ["Yes, yes," from Hon. Members.] No official copy then.

This, then, shows forcibly the intimate nature of the relations subsisting between us. When we desire to refer to the Canadian Year book, a most useful work, which during the present discussion ought to

81930

be in the hands of every member, we find but two copies. This, again, shows the extent of our communication with Canada. Her Majesty's Government seem to think that they know best what is for our interest, and it seems much as if they said to us "You are a Crown Colony, and you ought to remain one. You are not fit to govern yourselves; we do not want you; we will hand you over to Canada." I would rather that we were governed from Downing Street. It is not, in my opinion, necessary or desirable that this Colony should be Confederated with Canada. And now, Sir, let us glance at this Colony. I need not dilate upon what is known to all. I maintain, Sir, that this Colony is one of the richest portions of the world's surface; that it has unlimited supplies of lumber and spars; that it possesses coal, gold, and other minerals in abundance; that her waters teem with fish; that it is rich in everything. Take the climate; it is far better than that of England, far more temperate, far more bright and sunny, and, I may fairly add, far more healthy.

We are asked by the Honourable the Attorney General why the Country does not get on; and I will now proceed to tell you, Sir, why the Country has not prospered as it ought to have done. It is because the Government has paid too little attention to the acquisition of population. One very great drawback to its progress and the settlement of its land, is its proximity to the United States, that proximity is one of the chief reasons that it has not been peopled as it would have been; when we look at the energy and enterprise there, and at the field which the United States offers for Emigrants and the enterprising of all nations, how can we wonder that that Country is preferred to ours, and that people when they become dissatisfied here, should leave for the United States. The United States hem us in on every side, it is the Nation by which we exist, it is the Nation which has made this Colony what it is, but, nevertheless, it is one of our greatest drawbacks. We do not enjoy her advantages, nor do we profit much by them; we do not share her prosperity, and we are far too small to be her rival. The effect of a large body and a small body being brought into contact, is, that the larger will attract the smaller, and ultimately absorb it ["yes, yes," and "no, no."]

[Hon. Member for Kootenay--How about Switzerland?]

I say more, Sir, I say that the United States will probably ultimately absorb both this Colony and the Dominion of Canada ["no, no, no," from Mr. Trutch, Mr. Crease, and others]. Canada will in all probability find it quite as much to her advantage to join her ultimately, as we do now to join the Dominion. I say, Sir, that one cause of our want of prosperity has been the neglect of acquisition of population, and particularly of agricultural population. The next cause is that we have driven people out of the Colony.

I need only allude to our having deposed the Free Trade system. That deposition took population out of the Colony which has never been replaced, there was a depopulation of the Cities without any attempt having been made to obtain a substitute rural population; we are now asked to undergo another revolution which will ruin our farmers, and do no sort of good to those engaged in commercial pursuits.

I do not intend, Sir, to follow the details of the proposed terms at present, but there seem items which I must notice.

I hold in my hands the published returns of the Custom House receipts for last year, and this document shows plainly, that no less than half a million of dollars are sent out of the Colony every year for the purchase of agricultural productions, wheat, barley, flour, and cattle, all of which, considering the fertility of our soil, its abundance, the magnificent, salubrious, healthy, sunny, and more than temperate climate, we ought to produce ourselves; this Colony probably raises another half million's worth. If we adopt the Canadian Tariff we shall throw away this million of dollars, that is, the half million which we raise, and the half million which can be raised, and for what? For the sake of problematical benefits which some think likely to arise from Confederation. If Confederation should come and bring with it the Tariff of Canada, and it will do so, the great inducements which we now have to attract population, will be taken away. So far from Confederation benefiting the commercial community, I say it is much rather calculated to do them harm. No doubt if public works are undertaken, as we are told will be the case under Confederation, employment will be given for a time, but the supplies required will come from the United States, and our public works will actually be of more benefit to the United States, during their construction, than this Colony. What we want, is an enlarged outlet for our resources We want markets for our coal and lumber, we want our local industries fostered, and all of these can be obtained by a judicious arrangement of our own Tariff. Next, we want agricultural population, and any increase of this kind of population must depend upon the encouragement given. If our agricultural interests are left without encouragement, we shall not get an increased agricultural population; and, therefore, the country will not reap so much benefit from public works, as the supplies will come from the United States.

We shall find it difficult, Sir, to get a Tariff from Canada that will suit us, and I think that I shall be able to show you, Sir, that Confederation will not produce population. Anything that deprives this Colony of the power of protecting the local industries and interests of the Colony, and of regulating and fostering its commerce and trade, cannot be otherwise than dangerous and injurious to the country.

I feel perfectly sure, Sir, that if Confederation should come, bringing with it the Tariff of Canada, not only will the farmers be ruined, but our independence will be taken away; it will deprive our local industries of the protection now afforded them, and will inflict other burdens upon them; it will not free trade and commerce from the shackles which now bind them, and will deprive the Government of the power of regulating and encouraging those interests upon which the prosperity of the Colony depends.

There can be no permanent or lasting union with Canada, unless terms be made to promote and foster the material and pecuniary interests of this Colony. The only link which binds this Colony to Canada is Imperial. The people must be better off under Confederation than alone, or they will not put up with it. We are told, Sir, that public works are to be undertaken. I answer that they may do good to some, but the supplies both of food and raiment will come from the United States, who will in reality reap the lion's share of the benefit; and, what is more, as soon as the money was expended the people would begin to consider whether they were equally well off under Confederation, as they might be under another Government; and if a change should be desired, it is perfectly plain that Canada cannot use force to keep the people of this Colony within the Dominion, they must be better off under Confederation than alone, or they will not stop in the Confederacy.

Our true course, Sir, judging from the statistics is not to look to Canada, but to seek to extend our markets for our natural productions, and to obtain an agricultural productive population. I say, Sir, that there is no necessity for us to join Canada; we can get on very well by ourselves at present.

The Hon. Attorney General says Canada will take over our debts, but I say, Sir, that our debt in proportion to our population is very little more per head than that of Canada. When I state this, I mean that Indians are very large consumers and producers, and ought to be reckoned with the population. Our expenses will soon be much smaller. What I mean, Sir, is, that at the end of 1871, this Colony will save $50,000, for one of the loans will have expired, thus saving us $36,000, and floating loans will be funded, and we shall save ten or twelve thousand by that.

I shall not go into the question of Canada being able to defend this Colony; I do not believe, Sir, that Canada is able to defend itself. Great Britain has taken away her standing army. Canada will very soon be required to pay for the few troops that are left, and in the next place they will be asked to contribute to the expense of keeping up the navy.

Confederation would make the Dominion territorially greater, but would in case of war, be a source of weakness. It is people, not territory, that makes a country strong and powerful. To be strong, the union must be of people, and in my opinion that condition is wanting. I feel certain that Her Majesty's Government has no wish to be put to the expense of defending the country. No wish to be involved in quarrels with the United States. No wish to keep Canada depending upon her support, but rather a wish to force her into independence, to get rid of her altogether.

I am opposed to Confederation, because it will not serve to promote the industrial interests of this Colony, but on the contrary, it will serve to ruin many, and thus be detrimental to the interest and progress of the country. I say that Confederation

will be injurious to the Farmers, because protection is necessary to enable them to compete with farmers of the United States. The Tariff and Excise Laws do not supply that. They will be inimicial to brewers.

Inimical to the Spar Trade;
Inimical to Fisheries;
Inimical to Whaling Pursuits;
Inimical to Spar and Lumber Business.

Turn to the Canadian Tariff and you will find grain admitted free. I maintain that if the tariff now imposed upon cereals and agricultural produce be taken away, farmers of this Colony will be brought into competition with the farmers of the United States, and will succumb [Mr. DeCosmos—Lower Country Farmers.] Yes, and here the Resolutions are silent where they ought to be loudest.

I shall not attempt to prove that farmers did not prosper under Free Trade; be that as it may, they are now prosperous and becoming rich. There is no better advertisement for population than the fact of the present prosperity of the farmers. Take away that prosperity, and you do away with the chief inducement which you have for agricultural population.

I go on to brewers, and these interests, though in point of fact small, are in proportion as large with us, as larger interests would be to a larger population; moreover, we, having so small a population cannot afford to risk a change, because we cannot recuperate quickly. Under the Canadian law a brewer must take out a brewer's and malster's license, and has to pay one cent per pound on all malt made, and as there is an average amount of 1,248,000 pounds of malt consumed in the year, the average duty would amount to $12,680 per annum, in addition to which they will have to pay a malster's and brewer's license. The duty upon that amount of malt now is $3,750. Confederation therefore will increase the malt duty by nearly $9,000. Brewers would probably buy all their malt from abroad or cease to brew, especially when we take into consideration the annoyances connected with the bonding system. You will see, Sir, that this quantity of malt would take 500 acres of land to raise it, so that in addition to injuring the brewers, the farmers are also injured.

Under the Canadian Law, salmon must not be taken at the mouth of any river when they are going up for the purpose of spawning. We all know that they must be taken. If we are not allowed to catch them as they go up we should never get them at all. They never come down again; they go up to die.

Again, according to Canadian Law, whales must not be taken by means of bombs or firearms: and I am told they cannot be taken without firearms in these waters, so that under Confederation whales would be free to spout as they pleased.

Under Canadian Law, tobacco cannot be grown without excise duty: it has to be bonded, and its cultivation would be abandoned. Alkaline soil suits the tobacco plant, and I have very little doubt that tobacco could be grown profitably in many parts of British Columbia [Hon. Holbrook—It is grown]; but the excise duty.

When we come to lumber we find that there is an export duty on logs of $1 per 1000 feet: this will affect the spar business. [Hon. Barnard—No, it will not affect spars; the duty is upon logs only, which is cut into lumber, and is a protection to Canadian Lumber Mills.]

I have now, Sir, given you reasons why the general interests of the Colony will not be promoted. Farmers, Brewers, the Lumber Trade, and the Fisheries will not be benefited; who will? Canada will take no coal nor lumber from us, and will not increase our trade at all; but they will take our money, and much of that money derived from the very fact that we have to pay more for Canadian manufactures than the Eastern Provinces, or rather we are obliged to pay duties upon foreign articles, simply because we cannot obtain Canadian, and yet we are told that Confederation will reduce our taxation. Our Tariff is as low as that of Canada, save upon spirits and tobacco.

It would be absurd for us to sacrifice our interests in order that laws may be made for us by a people who know little of our condition and wants, and who in fact must necessarily legislate for the greater number—the people of the Atlantic Provinces. It is dangerous to place ourselves at the disposal of superior numbers.

I believe, Sir, that we are quite capable of making laws for ourselves.

If we are united, or rather absorbed, everything will centralize in Canada, and the whole country will be tributary to Canada. The number of Representatives sent to Ottawa from other places would overwhelm the number sent from British Columbia. Even in the matter of appropriations, where the scramble always is, this Colony would be overborne: we should be laughed at by the victors for our pretensions. It is the case in all other Colonies, and would be here.

It is absurd to suppose that the same laws, whether civil commercial, or industrial will be found equally advantageous to all parts of this great Continent. It manifestly cannot be so; the conditions are different. We know what is best for ourselves, and are able to legislate to effect that. We have no wish to pay Canada to do our legislation.

No union between this Colony and Canada can permanently exist, unless it be to the material and pecuniary advantage of this Colony to remain in the union. The sum of the interests of the inhabitants is the interest of the Colony. The people of this Colony have, generally speaking, no love for Canada; they care, as a rule, little or nothing about the creation of another Empire, Kingdom, or Republic; they have but little sentimentality, and care little about the distinctions between the form of Government of Canada and the United States.

Therefore no union on account of love need be looked for. The only bond of union outside of force—and force the Dominion has not—will be the material advantage of the country and pecuniary benefit of the inhabitants. Love for Canada has to be acquired by the prosperity of the country, and from our children.

I say, Sir, it is absurd for us to ally ourselves with a people with whom we have, and can have, no communication. The Tariff and Excise Laws of Canada will ruin the dominant interests of this Colony, and we are told that those laws must rule according to the conditions of the "British North America Act." A Tariff perhaps excellent to the Eastern Provinces, is ruin to British Columbia. Our Tariff imposes a large duty on spirits, and a duty on agricultural produce. The Canadian Tariff imposes none on agricultural produce, and a small duty on spirits.

If we are Confederated with Canada we become its tributary, and in all that concerns us chiefly Canada has to act for us. In all our chief concerns, commerce, shipping, and mercantile laws, agriculture, trade, navigation, fisheries, currency, banking—Canada rules. She may tax us to any extent, and in any manner she pleases, so that it is quite possible we may have export duties on gold and coal.

All such things as require money for their performance are left for the Colony to provide; those that require intellect are supplied by Canada.

The expense to Canada is constantly decreasing, her revenue constantly increasing. The expense of the Local Government on the other hand, is constantly increasing, and out of proportion to any increase of its revenue.

Is it necessary that we should pay for the intellect of Canada? Is our own not as good? Do we not know what is best for ourselves? Cannot we do all as well as they? Cannot we pay our Colonial intellect to do our business well, instead of theirs to do it badly?

The very means by which we ought to make our roads are taken from us, so that, as time rolls on, we shall have to provide other taxes, and raise loans for the purpose. The other countries have gone into Confederation with roads ready made, and large loans and large debts.

It is not fair to put this country upon a footing of its present population; on its present income; a future income ought to be calculated upon.

I do not think it wise to ruin the present population for the sake of the future.

Remember that to have a population, that population must be able to live. Confederation will ruin the farmer, and destroy at once the greatest inducement to immigration; will ruin the brewer and the fisheries; do no good to commerce; afford no larger market for lumber, coal, or anything else; in fact do a great deal of harm and no good, save that which is problematical and fanciful.

In conclusion, I have to say that I sincerely trust that our deliberations may result in good, and that whatever may be the issue of this debate, it may be for the good of the Colony.

I accord most heartily with the learned Attorney General in the belief that—

"There's a Divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough hew them how we may."

The Hon. Mr. DRAKE, Member for Victoria City, rose and said, Sir, I will move an amendment to the Resolution of the Hon. Attorney General—"That the consideration of this question be postponed for six months." I need not state, Sir, that I have always been opposed to Confederation, I have consistently opposed Confederation on any terms up to the present time, and I do not see any reason now to change my opinion. I do not say that Confederation must be bad for all time, the time may come when it will be a benefit or a necessity; but at present, I do not believe that Confederation would be a benefit to British Columbia. The time has not yet arrived for it. I was sent to this Council as an opponent of Confederation. I oppose it from conviction, and I shall still continue to oppose it.

The question of Confederation has been advocated by certain parties for some years past, and why?

Because there has been a general feeling of dissatisfaction throughout the Colony, a general feeling of pressure from heavy taxation on a daily diminishing basis. The people have been suffering under a desire for change; that is what is at the bottom of this discussion.

Confederation has been discussed outside, in the public press, and in other places, and now after years of agitation by secret and unknown partizans, it has cropped up in this Council as a Government measure. I know, Sir, that I have no chance of carrying this amendment. I have not the slightest hope of carrying it, but I move it with the view of bringing the question fairly before the public. I should deeply regret that this Council should be able to bind the Colony for ever. The question is one of the greatest magnitude, greater by far than any other which has ever come before this Legislature. I am glad that it must hereafter be referred to another Council, the majority of whose members will have to come before the people for election. I think, however, that it is waste of time to bring this measure before this Council.

There are some points in Confederation, I admit, which are worthy of consideration, or would be under different circumstances. The idea of consolidating the British Possessions on this Continent, is an idea which is likely to carry people away. The idea of assisting to found a large and wide spreading country might be dazzling to some. But if we are to be turned over to Canada with no change in our form of Government, no alteration in the management of our political affairs, where is the advantage of any change. It will simply be a change from "King Stork" to "King Log." The Officials will be chosen by the Dominion Government instead of the Crown; we should be transferred from the rule of Statesmen at Downing Street to that of Politicians at Ottawa. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos]. All our political rights will be taken away, the whole of the legislation will pass out of our hands into that of the Dominion at Ottawa; those laws upon which we shall be entitled to pass an opinion, will be much of the same nature as those upon which a municipality or vestry may vote; but which are beneath the dignity of a Colony. All power of raising taxes, except as the Hon. Member for the District reminds me, for provincial purposes, we shall be subject to the provisions of the Organic Act, which we have no power to change. Any terms which we can impose, must be subject to the provisions of the "British North America Act." My position, therefore, is correct, when I say that our power will not exceed that of a municipality. We are told that we are not fit for Representative Institutions or Responsible Government. Then we shall go into the Dominion as a Crown Colony—bound hand and foot. The few Members that will represent us at Ottawa, will not have the power to do anything for us. I do not trust the Politicians of Ottawa. I do not desire to give them the power to raise money upon our vast and rich territory, whilst we should get nothing from Canada in return. I would rather remain as we are, with some change and modification in our Government.

I admit that Confederation offers great advantages to those Provinces which are contiguous to Canada; there they have a mutuality of interests; they are able to use the products of the Dominion; they have community of interests; and there is no extent of wild, unsettled country between them and the seat of Government. We are divided by upwards of 4,000 miles from Halifax, 2,000 of which is an unknown wilderness. Some explorers who have travelled by that route say, that the greater part of the country is alkaline and unfit for settlement. There is, no doubt, a large tract of fertile land in the valley of the Saskatchewan, but much of the intervening territory is unknown. I ask, Sir, is not our position as a territory of Great Britain, far in advance of what it would be as a Province of the Dominion? Will not the change operate disadvantageously?

We know that our interests can hardly conflict with those of Great Britain; can we say the same as regards the Dominion. Canada is hampered by her vast territory, and the larger that territory becomes, the greater her weakness will be. But, Sir, I ask of what use is this vast territory, unpeopled and uncultivated. Canada wants population and capital, this Colony wants the same. Upon looking at the returns of population, I find that two-thirds of the emigrants go over the border to the United States, and many native-born Canadians go to the United States, because they find there a more genial climate, and more work to do. If Canada teemed with population like England, where people cannot find work for their hands to do, I could conceive it likely that we might acquire population through Canada, but I cannot see how we can gain population unless a Railway were not only commenced, but in such a state of progress as to be a means and inducement for population to come into the country, and this is not likely, in my opinion, to be the case. I have listened to what my Honourable colleague has said about the agricultural interests, and I entirely coincide with him. Our farmers cannot compete with the farmers of the United States, under the Canadian Tariff. In the United States, farmers are able to get everything that they want within their own country, whilst here everything comes from abroad. Until the farmers of this Colony can make everything that they require for their own use, they cannot compete with those of the United States. We can always import American goods, even under a heavy duty, cheaper than Canadian goods, and this, Sir, will put this Province under a different condition as compared with other Provinces.

Let us then suppose this Confederation scheme carried out; we will consider the sacrifice completed, the victim decorated with the conditions which have been graciously accorded by the more powerful contracting party. What will become of our farmers? I refer more particularly to the farmers of the Island and of the Lower Fraser. This class I look upon as the bone and sinew of the country. They, Sir, I say, will be driven out of their own market by the cheaper productions of the States. And, I would ask, what industry it is supposed will take the place of agriculture? Moreover, Sir, I would ask if we be confederated upon these terms, what guarantee has the Colony that the terms will be carried out? We all know that when compacts are made between a large and a small power, the larger can break the treaty with impunity when an emergency arises. Would Canada hesitate, in the event of having to repel a Fenian invasion, to abandon the Railway. We have no guarantee that the Dominion will carry out the terms to which her Statesmen may agree. We may be abandoned at any time. The benefits of the larger Provinces of Canada, will always take precedence of those of British Columbia, whose Representatives will be in a small minority. And I would never consent to Confederation on any terms without an Imperial guarantee that the terms would be observed and kept. History tells us that in a compact between a larger and smaller country, the smaller must go to the wall.

I sum up my objections to Confederation in a few words:

At the present time, I think that any terms will be inimical to this Colony, on account of our distance from Canada; on account of the smallness of our population, for we never can have an equal vote in the Dominion Parliament with other Provinces; on account of the danger of our farming interests being killed and crushed; and on account of the unsettled state of the intervening territory; and even if the North West Territory were confederated, what advantage would it be to us?

Our Confederation would be a source of weakness to Canada, and to ourselves.

We are so far separated from Canada, that she can only communicate with us by telegraph through the United States, and by ships round the southern extremity of the American Continent.

We are told that Confederation is an Imperial necessity. We have nothing to do with this. We must look to our own interests. Confederation is a political idea; it may be part of the Imperial policy, but what of that. We are told that Great Britain desires to get rid of all her Colonies.

These are serious matters for consideration, and this question ought not to be dealt with as a party measure. I offer these remarks in the hope that any legislation which may result from this debate, after it has received popular sanction, may be enduring and of advantage to the Colony.

The Hon. Mr. RING, Member for Nanaimo, said—Mr. President, I rise to second the amendment of the Hon. Member for Victoria, and in doing so I abstain from dealing with the merits of the question. It appears that the Governor wishes to have a popular vote upon the question of Confederation. I say then, let there be an extended suffrage given, so that the voice of the people may be heard in this House. I hope that the people will have the opportunity of expressing their opinion, Aye or No, whether they will have Confederation. The people should not be bound by what occurs in a Council constituted as this is.

I say, Sir, that the material question for decision, is not that of terms. The Government, if this amendment is carried, will have the opportunity of hearing the voice of the people. On behalf of my constituents I say they do not want Confederation, they believe that it is undesirable at present. The proper way to find out the opinion of the country, is for the Governor to give us the enlarged representation promised. Let the question come before the people in a fair way.

I do not desire to go into the general question of terms of Confederation upon this occasion. But I must say, Sir, that these resolutions are not based upon the minds of the people. I protest, Sir, against the people's name being mixed up with those resolutions. I reserve what I have to say on the question of terms, and support the amendment of the Hon. Member for Victoria, in order that the people may have an opportunity of passing their vote upon the question of Confederation.

The Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS, Member for Lillooet, moved the adjournment of the debate. Withdrawn.

The Hon. Mr. ROBSON, Member for New Westminster, rose and said:—Sir, I had intended to reserve any remarks that I intended to offer until the terms submitted by the Government were under debate in Committee, but I have an objection to the adjournment of the debate at this early hour. I cannot, however, allow certain expressions which have fallen from the Honourable the senior Member for Victoria City to pass unnoticed. I believe the question for us to consider is,—Shall we have Confederation, and upon what terms?

I believe this House is ready to say Aye to the first question, and to go into Committee of the Whole on the second.

I am surprised to find an Honourable Member of this House, who is a Cabinet Minister, expressing his regret that this measure has come down to this Council as a Government measure. I think that the freedom of his remarks contradicts the idea that it is a Government measure, in the sense that Government Members must vote for it.

I was also surprised to hear the Honourable Member, who is a Cabinet Minister, say that Confederation would not be the only issue at the polls; but that there was another place besides Ottawa to which we could go. I had hoped that all allusion to this matter would have been kept out of this debate; for I say, Sir, that this vague language can have but one meaning, particularly when it is added that the United States will ultimately absorb British Columbia, and Canada as well. The Honourable Member evidently means,—Shall we have Confederation, or accept, as an alternative, Annexation? As everything that comes from the Honourable Member is entitled to great weight, and especially as he is a Member of the Government, I think we have a right to know whether that is really the issue or not. I had hoped that this debate would have been carried through without the necessity of making use of the word "Annexation," but as the subject has been dragged in by a Member of the Government, I trust I shall be pardoned for alluding to it. I say, Sir, that if the Government really means to ask whether the people desire Confederation or another union, let us know it. ["No, no," from the Attorney General and Mr. Trutch.] I am at a loss to understand the position of the Honourable Member for Victoria. I am anxious to have it explained. If he has not represented Cabinet views correctly this House should be set right

Waiving these matters, and assuming that the Honourable Member will be able to explain the apparent paradox, I pass on to the objections raised. I find the Honourable Member distinctly setting himself in opposition to Confederation. I will not follow him for the purpose of rebutting so-called arguments against Confederation.

The Honourable gentleman tells us that Confederation is unnecessary, that this Colony is one of the richest spots on the face of the earth, with a climate inferior to no part of the world,—why should it not go on alone? And he tells us that this view of the question is taken by the majority of the people of the Colony. Why, Sir, the Colony has had all this opportunity for fifteen years; and what is the fact? Ten years ago the Colony had a very much larger population than now, and very much larger commerce. Are we, then, under these circumstances, to ask the people to wait and work out their own salvation? But, Sir, in addition, we are told in a State paper, that we are not to be allowed to hang on to the skirts of Great Britain, like a mendicant's child. I can hardly reconcile the position of manly independence with the position of hanging on to unwilling Imperial skirts. Rather than that, I would ask for union with the Sandwich Islands, or with Hindostan. British Columbia has tried long enough to get on by herself. After fifteen years hard struggle, she finds herself worse off than she was at the beginning. Her progress has been like that of the crab—backward.

She might make progress, but, unfortunately, her form of Government has rendered progress impossible. I believe that the illiberal form of Government has had much to do with keeping away population—with *driving* away population,—and with destroying the spirit of manly enterprise of those who are here. Apart from its being the policy of the British Government to unite all the British American Colonies in one great Confederation, if we persist in remaining alone we shall be told by the Imperial Government that we are not fit for liberal institutions, and not prepared for self-government. We should get no amelioration. Downing Street Officials would say that we are not fit for Responsible Government, and that we ought to confederate.

There is no difficulty in showing that Confederation will be beneficial to British Columbia; that is to say Confederation on proper terms. I do not say that Confederation would be entirely satisfactory on the terms proposed in the Government programme. The terms, although excellent, do not go far enough, but I can hardly understand any man taking the position that under those terms, even as they are, Confederation would not be beneficial. The public works proposed would make the population of the Colony double what it is now. No man can conceal from himself, looking at the question dispassionately, that the construction of the Railway alone would bring a very great increase to our labouring and productive population.

We are told that the tariff of the Dominion would crush our farming and industrial interests. Why, Sir, that tariff is a little more than a third lighter than ours, and would relieve us of that one-third of present taxation; and our Customs duties, it must be borne in mind, are taken by the Dominion Government. Although in its present form, the tariff would be ill-adapted to some of our local interests which we desire to protect, it should be remembered that the Canadian tariff is now under revision, as regards the free admission of American productions; and under Confederation we shall in all probability have a treaty of reciprocity; or, if not, certainly a revised tariff which would meet American productions, which now find a free market in the Dominion, with a protective duty. The argument of the Honourable Member with regard to tariff and farming interests is then swept away by that fact. [Dr. Helmcken—"Is it a fact"?]

This subject is one of the greatest importance. All other questions are overshadowed by it. It is the most important one ever debated on the British Pacific. It has been justly said it is a step for life, for better for worse. The question must be approached in a fair spirit, and in dealing with it we ought to be thoroughly honest with ourselves; and in dealing with facts, I hope that allowance will be made for what has been said, for I believe that much of the present opposition arises out of ancient prejudices. Why do we find an Honourable gentleman who has grown grey in the service of his country, and for whom we have respect amounting to veneration, talking of centralization of every interest under Confederation at Ottawa? Does the union of Washington Territory and Oregon,

with other States of the Great Republic, mean centralization at Washington? [Dr. Helmcken, "Yes."]

Then, Sir, where would be the advantage of union in that other direction that has been alluded to? Certain persons are fond of talking about the advantages of Annexation; all arguments in its favor can be brought with redoubled force in favor of Confederation. British Columbia as a member of the union would have a Pacific frontage, but only in common with other countries of the Union. As a part of the Dominion she would have more, for she would be the only outlet of the British Confederacy on the Pacific Coast.

Exception has been taken by the Honourable Gentleman to the fishery laws of the Dominion; and it is said that the whales and salmon will cry out for Confederation to protect them. If the Canadian fishery laws were enforced in their present form, it is possible that the salmon might escape, and the whales might spout with impunity; but we have a right to expect that the Dominion Parliament will adapt these laws to this Colony, on the representations of the Members from this Province. It would be absurd to suppose that, if the fishery laws of the Dominion were inimical to British Columbia, they would be enforced; the nature of the union will be such as to make the interests of this part of the Dominion identical with other parts. We cannot suppose that the Dominion Parliament would seek to injure this Province. A man would not wantonly injure the smallest member of his body. He could not do so without feeling it. No man can neglect or injure any member of his own body with impunity. If one member, however humble, suffers, all the members will suffer with it. Community of interest is the best guarantee for fair play to every section. The Dominion is made up of Provinces, and the prosperity of the Dominion means the prosperity of the Provinces of which it is composed.

If we could believe that the Government of the Dominion were composed of men of so little wisdom as the opponents of Confederation seem to think, I would say do not let us join them. But I believe, Sir, and the Imperial Government believes, and British Columbia believes, that the Government of the Dominion is composed of statesmen. And I say, Sir, that since these statesmen have grasped the great idea of Confederation, they have proved themselves fit to govern an empire. I am suprised to find any Honourable Member venturing to suggest that Canada either could not, or would not, fulfil her pledges. The Dominion Government is one and the same in this matter with the Imperial Government. The Imperial Government stands at the back of the Dominion Government, and will be equally concerned in the fulfilment of the stipulations in their integrity; and it is time to impugn the honor of Canada when she refuses to keep the terms. With regard to Nova Scotia, a departure was made from the terms of Union. The Imperial Government, and the Canadian Government, considered that certain concessions ought to be made, and they were made, but only to add to the terms in favor of Nova Scotia. British Columbia places herself in a false position before Canada, and before the world, in saying that there is any doubt as to whether the Dominion would fulfil the terms.

With regard again to the tariff. I think that the only arguments against Confederation worthy of consideration, are against the present Canadian Tariff. The Customs Tariff is a federal matter, and I confess that the arguments against the applicability of the present scale to British Columbia, are entitled to notice: but, Sir, as I said before, I think these arguments are to a great extent met by the fact that we shall have an amended tariff, or a reciprocity treaty. But if we could hit upon some scheme that, without infringing the Dominion prerogatives, would meet our requirements, it would be most desirable, and shall have my hearty support.

In conclusion, Sir, the Government measure shall meet with my hearty support, so far as it goes.

It affords me unspeakable gratification to find that Government has sent down a measure for Confederation which can hardly be cavilled at.

While feeling pleasure in giving a hearty general support to this measure, I shall reserve to myself the right to suggest that other items shall be placed in the list now before the House.

I believe there are terms of the greatest importance which ought to be added. But anything that can be added will not meet the wishes of the people of this Colony, unless the fundamental principle of Self Government accompanies them. I believe that the Canadians are a great, a wise, and a conservative people; but I conceive we should be doing a great wrong to ourselves, to our children, and to those who are to come after us, if we left out Responsible Government.

Suppose, Sir, the case of three persons forming a partnership; if the third partner, coming in subsequently, should consent to leave the management of his private affairs to the firm, he would not only be giving up his own rights, but he would be throwing into the partnership a great element of discord. I say then that while Canada necessarily and properly asks us to surrender the larger questions, she does not ask us to relinquish our smaller and local rights, and if we give them up we shall be doing a wanton thing and a great wrong.

In promising my support, therefore, I make this reservation. That, if this Colony is to become a Province of Canada, the people of British Columbia shall have the right to manage their own local affairs, as fully as every other Province has. For, while I agree with the Honourable Junior Member for Victoria, that the change from Downing Street to Ottawa would be useless without a change in the system of Government, I say that it would be most injurious to go into Confederation upon terms which might inaugurate a fresh era of political agitation, which would probably continue for a series of years.

Hon. Mr HELMCKEN—Sir, I rise for the purpose of explaining.

I deny that I uttered any such thing as that the choice would be put to the people by the Government between two issues of Confederation and any other union.

But that if the Canadian Government refuses to agree to terms equivalent to these, but chooses to offer some mean terms for consideration, when it comes to the polls the people themselves will raise the issue between Confederation and the only other change which offers itself for consideration.

The Debate was here adjourned until Thursday, at 1 o'clock.

---

THURSDAY, 10TH MARCH, 1870.

---

The debate was resumed by the Hon. Mr. TRUTCH, Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, who said:—Mr. President, in rising to renew the debate on the question which has been brought before the House by the Honourable the Attorney General, I desire to express my regret that I was prevented yesterday, by indisposition, from speaking in support of the motion which I had the honour to second, because I fear that by the delay I may have laid myself open to the charge of waiting to reply to objections that might be urged against this motion, instead of at once supporting it upon positive and and substantial grounds, as I hold it to be incumbent on those to do who advocate so important a measure. I must also ask the indulgence of the House if I find it necessary to follow the Hon. the Attorney General over ground already so fully and ably occupied by him, as rather than leave out anything in the history of this question which is pertinent to my argument, I will run the risk of laying myself open to the charge of plagiarism. In the first place, then, I must ask you, Sir, to allow me to trace the history of Confederation in this Council as shewn in the debates which have taken place on the subject. You will find, Sir, that this subject was first introduced into this Council on the 29th of March, 1867, when a Resolution in favour of the abstract principle of the Confederation of the British Provinces in North America, and expressing the desire that this Colony should be allowed the opportunity of entering the Dominion, upon fair and equitable terms, at some future time, was unanimously agreed to. I do not quite take the view of the Honourable the Attorney General with respect to the discussions that have taken place on this question; for, Sir, I think that the question is now for the first time brought before this House and the country in a practical shape, for a full and deliberate expression of opinion. The vote which was taken in 1867, according to my understanding of it at that time, went no further than to express a desire on the part of the Colony to be confederated with Canada, when a favourable occasion should arrive, and the result of that vote was, I believe, the insertion of the clause in the "British North America Act," on which the measure we are now discussing is based. Again, in 1868,

when the Hon. Member for District No. 2, introduced a series of Resolutions setting forth terms on which this Colony should be united with Canada, the sense of the House, as then expressed, was that we were not possessed of sufficient information to enable us to come to any practical resolution on the subject; and, Sir, when the terms and conditions then proposed for the consideration of the House are compared with those now submitted for your adoption, no words are needed to show that the conclusion then arrived at was judicious.

Last year, again, the subject was introduced by the Hon. Dr. Davie, to a reluctant House. We all felt that there were circumstances which rendered its discussion then in this Council inexpedient, although the question of Confederation was even then occupying public attention to an absorbing extent, and had in fact been the test question at the elections a short time previously in the Districts in this part of the Colony. But certain remarks of the Hon. Member for Cariboo, in reference to the position of Government Members on this question, compelled the expression of the views of the Council on the subject at that time, in a Resolution pointing out the practical impossibility of the Union of this Colony with Canada, until the North-West Territory was amalgamated with the Dominion.

But now circumstances are entirely changed. The Hudson Bay Company's rights in that region, known as the North-West Territory, are determined by purchase, and that country is practically part of the Dominion of Canada, for the temporary opposition from a certain class of the population of the Red River Settlement, to the assumption of the Government by the Canadian authorities is passing away, if not by the present moment virtually at an end: and treating that ebullition of feeling resulting from misapprehension of the real intention of the Dominion Government as passed away, I regard it as an established fact that, as stated in Lord Granville's Despatch, our boundaries are now conterminous with those of Canada.

But not only is Union with Canada now practicable, but, Sir, I regard the present as a most opportune moment for its consummation. I entirely agree with Hon. Members who say that this Colony requires a change. In its present depressed state, the Colony needs assistance and fresh impetus. There are many causes which combine to contribute to the depression now observable in the country. It has been attributed to the present form of Government. Take that as one cause if you please; but, Sir, I believe it has had very little effect, if any, in producing this result, and you will find many other and mightier reasons to account for it. Chiefly, I believe with the Hon. Attorney General, that this depression is attributable to the isolated position of the Colony, and to the cold shade thrown over us by the neighbourhood of the Territories of the United States, from whom we can never hope for aid in advancing the interests of this Colony whilst under the British Flag. The desire for some change is urgent, and if we wait for more prosperous times, and for which to claim better financial terms, we may realize the old proverb of the "Horse starving whilst the grass is growing." Besides, Sir, on reference to the terms now proposed for the consideration of this House by the Government, it will be found that they are based not altogether on the present condition of the Colony, but somewhat on an anticipated increase of population and prosperity; and I suppose we might wait many years before such a measure of prosperity would accrue to us, as to entitle us to ask better financial terms than are included in these Resolutions.

I believe the time, then, to be opportune, and I think that there is every reason to suppose that the present Government of the Dominion is now desirous and ready to grant us fair and liberal terms.

I believe, Sir, the Canadian Government are favourably disposed towards us, and prepared to go to the utmost of their ability in all reasonable matters to enable us to join the Confederation. The policy and wishes of the Imperial Government too in the same direction are clearly enunciated in Earl Granville's despatch; and we are fortunate in having now at the head of the Executive a Governor admirably adapted by his ability and experience to take charge, on our behalf, of negociations for our union with the Dominion, and to whom the interests of the community may confidently be entrusted.

And that brings me, Sir, to this point. That in its first introduction into this Council, this measure must necessarily be a Government measure. The constitution of this House renders it imperative that the initiatory steps should be taken by the Government, although the final acceptance of the terms will properly rest with the people. The policy of the Imperial Government has been clearly stated: it encourages us to amalgamate our interests with Canada, and points out the advantages to be thus obtained, and nothing that I could add would enunciate more clearly than that document the grounds on which Her Majesty's Government, on behalf of this Colony, favour Confederation.

This leads me to remark on the part that has been taken in reference to this question by the Official Members of this House, especially by the Executive Officers. Our position has been misapprehended, or if not misapprehended, it has been misrepresented, and I feel it my duty to allude to the false impressions which have been spread abroad on this subject. It has been stated that the Official Members have been obstructive to Confederation, with regard to their own official positions and interests. But this is not the fact. On a matter so clearly involving a question of Imperial policy, we were not at liberty to anticipate the views of the Home Government, which have now for the first time been distinctly made public. The Hon. Attorney General and myself have consistently affirmed the principle of Confederation; and we have always felt that we could safely confide our personal interests to the care of the Imperial Government, whose servants we are. To Her Majesty's Government those interests are entrusted by the Resolutions proposed for your adoption; and, Sir, we are well satisfied that this question as it affects us personally should so depend. We have been right, Sir, I believe, in not anticipating the views of the Imperial Government, for the terms of union now submitted for your adoption prove the wisdom of the course which we have pursued; and in the exercise of caution we have shewn ourselves the truest friends of the Colony, even though we have not appeared to be the most enthusiastic advocates of Confederation.

This, then, is a Government measure, as the Honourable the senior Member for Victoria City has told you, and as I hold it is of necessity a Government measure. This scheme is propounded by the Government, as the guardians of the interests of this infant Colony, and I stand here as a member of the Government to support the Resolutions which are now before you; and I sincerely trust that they will be adopted by this Council. But His Excellency has told us that the ultimate acceptance or rejection of the terms of union with Canada, after they have been submitted to the Dominion Government, shall be left to the popular voice of this Country.

I will now, Sir, come to the consideration of what Confederation is in the abstract, as I understand it. It is the union and consolidation of British interests in British Territory on this Continent, for the security and advancement of each Province individually, and of the whole collectively, under the continued support of the British Flag. A great idea of great minds, which have thus given a practical refutation to that doctrine of "America for the United States" known as the "Munro doctrine," held by leading politicians of the States south of us; and on this account, if on no other grounds, the principle of Confederation deserves the support of every British heart in the Colony.

I am now brought to a subject which I should not have known how to approach, but for the bridge thrown over for me by the Hon. Member for Victoria yesterday. By that Hon. Member the suggestion of a closer union with another country—with the United States in fact,—and the possibility that at the next General Election such an union might be presented as an alternative to Confederation with Canada, was introduced in so palpable a manner, that I should feel myself derelict to my duty as a Member of the Executive and as a Member of this Council if I did not refer to it.

Mr. President, I should do violence to my best feelings were I to refrain from availing myself of this opportunity of paying my humble tribute of respect and esteem for the people of that great Republic. ["Hear, hear," from all sides.] No one can better appreciate than I do the high and eminent qualities which characterise that great Nation, and especially that national feeling—that love of country, so worthy of our imitation—for which they have made such sacrifices. It has been my fortune to pass several years in the United States, and to have formed there

some of the most valued friendships of my life, so that my acquaintance with Americans has led me to form a most appreciative estimate of their social and domestic relations, of which I can not speak in terms of too much praise. But my experience of the political institutions of that Country only led me to prize our own more highly, and made me more than ever an Englishman; and I rejoice at the opportunity now afforded me of raising my voice against any movement tending in the direction of incorporating this Country with the United States.

I must now make passing allusion to a petition gotten up in some mysterious way, looked upon here at first as a mere joke; so insignificant that it would not be worthy of notice but for the use made of it elsewhere. It has been represented in other quarters as expressing the views of a great portion of this community. It has been so represented in very high quarters, and I therefore notice it; and in doing so I feel compelled to state that, so far as I could learn, it was signed by a very small number of people—forty-two I believe in all—many of whom were aliens, and most of whom were foreign-born subjects, and who appear to have been generally actuated by prejudice, based upon a lack of information respecting Canada and the Canadians, and not by any regard for the permanent benefit of the community. But as this petition has been followed up by the publication of letters and by a discussion in the newspapers, which we cannot blink, as to what has been termed the Annexation of this Colony to the United States; and as allusion was made to it, by an inuendo at all events, in this Council yesterday, I feel bound to express my opinion of what our position would be under any such union as has been hinted at.

If British Columbia were placed in the same position as Washington Territory, we should be absolutely without representation—for that Territory has one representative in Congress it is true, but he has no vote—and all our Officials would come from Washington. Annexation to the United States would also entail on us largely increased taxation, and would most materially affect an interest which the Hon. Member for Victoria told you would suffer most from Confederation. Why, Sir, under the union suggested, our farmers would be brought into direct competition with the farmers of Washington Territory and Oregon, and then our agricultural interests would be indeed annihilated. Again, if this country were American Territory you would have the whole influence of San Francisco brought to bear against the mercantile interests of Victoria; no hope could we have of building up a port here to rival San Francisco; no, Sir, you would never see a foreign vessel in these waters. I see no advantages in the suggestion; I have heard none pointed out, unless it be the questionable expectation that American capital might buy up the real estate in and around Victoria, and so give the present holders the opportunity of realizing their property into money and then leave the country to its fate. But in this hope, Sir, I believe they would be egregiously disappointed. I will not pursue the subject any further; Annexation is entirely out of the question, and I should not have dared to allude to it, but for the introduction of the subject by another Honourable Member yesterday. What do these foreign petitioners propose to transfer? Themselves? Their own property? No; not themselves, nor that which belong to them, but the whole Colony, the soil of this vast domain which belongs to the Crown and the people of England; this I regard as treasonable. In supporting Confederation I support the flag I serve. I say that loyalty is no exploded idea, call it a sentiment if you will; life is nothing without sentiment; everyone whose soul is not dead must cling to love of Country and attachment to her flag, as one of the most cherished sentiments of the heart, and I regard loyalty as one of the most deep-rooted and highly prized treasures of the human breast. ["Hear, hear," from all sides.]

Bear with me, Sir, while I tell now what I think Confederation is not. I don't think it necessarily means Responsible Government, or, as an Honourable Member at the other end of the House has put it, that it means getting rid of Government Officials. If that Honourable Member's desire is to be rid of the present incumbents of office so that others may take their place, I think it probable that his wishes in this respect may be gratified through Confederation: and in that case I could only hope that the change would be beneficial to the Colony. But I doubt much if this measure would receive support from this Council on these grounds; and at all events the Honourable Gentleman cannot expect much sympathy on that score from this side of the House.

Again, Confederation does not, to my mind, mean Responsible Government, as some Honourable Members hold. British Columbia will assuredly get Responsible Government as soon as the proper time arrives, as soon, that is to say, as the community is sufficiently advanced in population, and in other respects, to render such a form of Government practically workable; sooner probably through Confederation, than by any other means, and the sooner the better I say. But I do not think it desirable to fetter or cumber the proposed terms of union with anything about Responsible Government, and specially for the reason that we should find it very difficult to arrive at any conclusion in favor of it. Great difference of opinion exists upon the subject even around this Council Board, and I am by no means sure that the strongest opposition to Responsible Government would come from the Government side of the House. It is easier to change the constitution after Confederation than before. ["No, no."] Under the Organic Act, this Colony could get Responsible Government. In fact it is the special prerogative under this Act, of each Province to regulate the constitution of its own Executive Government and Legislature; and whence this desire to act so prematurely now in this respect?

Another Honourable Member has told you that in his opinion Confederation means the terms—means a Railway; but I take it, Sir, that the terms proposed result from Confederation, and that the railway is a means to the end, for we cannot have real Confederation without a Railway. But, Sir, I advocate Confederation on principle; and I believe the terms to be the natural result of Confederation. They flow from it as a natural consequence, as the effect proceeds from the cause. I believe that by Confederation, we are to gain those advantages which are set forth in the terms.

If it could be shown that by acceptance of these terms we should in any way sacrifice our honour—lose any political status that we now enjoy, I would not support Confederation if it brought a dozen Railroads. But I believe that each member of this community will be raised by the change. We shall have a distinct and very respectable representation in the House of Commons and Senate. We shall have as representatives there, men whose voice will be heard, men whose duty it will be to speak for us. Far from entertaining the views expressed by the two Honourable Members for Victoria, I am inclined to think with the Honourable Member for New Westminster, that this Colony will have its due weight and influence in the Dominion, that its representatives will be heard and listened to in the Canadian Parliament, and that this will be a favored portion of the Confederation, when admitted, on account of its position as the outlet of Canada on the Pacific. I do not, then, advocate Confederation specially on account of the terms. I find in its general merits ample grounds for support, and I consider, as I have said, that the terms follow as a matter of course.

The Honourable Member for Victoria has said that we are bound to prove the benefits. It is difficult to prove any thing to some minds. The benefits of Confederation are among those things which being in futurity we cannot prove. I cannot prove that which has not happened. We can only rely on human judgment and experience, and argue that such and such things will occur, as certain causes will produce certain effects. I, and other Official Members of this Colony, have a considerable interest in this Council; I have to a certain extent identified myself with it and its concerns for some years past, and speaking as an individual Member of this Council, if I did not believe that Confederation would prove advantageous to this Colony, and redound to the benefit of our local interests, I should not support it by my voice. I might as a Government servant vote for it as a Government measure, but I should not be standing here to speak for it and to advocate it as heartily as I do. It is hardly possible to show where the Colony will be benefitted by Confederation, without discussing the terms, which is not my present intention to do, but I promise Honourable Members that if these Resolutions get into Committee, I will fully satisfy them of the local advantages that must accrue to the Colony from union with Canada, on the terms proposed in these Resolutions.

I believe, Sir, that many of the objections which have been raised to Confederation have arisen from prejudiced feelings. I have no reason to be prejudiced

against or partial to Canada. I believe that Canadians as a people are no better than others and no worse. I have no ties in Canada, no particular reason for entertaining any feeling of affection for Canada; and if I did not believe that the advance which we make will be met in a becoming spirit, ["hear, hear,"] then I should be of opinion that Confederation would be nothing more than an union on paper, one not beneficial to this Colony or to Canada. There are Statesmen there, Sir, who know that it would be useless to try to beat us down on terms, for what would be the use of Confederation if it afterwards turned out that this Colony was injured, rather than benefited, by it.

The Honourable Junior Member for Victoria asks what guarantee have we that the terms will be carried out. I say at once, Sir, that if the terms are not carried out, if the Canadian Government repudiate their part of the agreement, we shall be equally at liberty to repudiate ours. [Dr. Helmcken—"How?"] We should, I maintain, be at liberty to change; but I for one do not approach this subject with any such feeling. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos.] There are always two sides to a bargain, and if the terms which are frankly and honestly proposed, are not fairly and honourably dealt with, we should in my opinion be at perfect liberty to draw back.

There is, however, one real and practical objection which has always suggested itself to my mind, from the first; and that is, that the same measures that apply to the circumstances of Canada, such as tariff, will not apply equally in all respects to this Colony. It will be asked, then, why is there no suggestion as to some alteration or modification of the tariff in the terms. The reason is somewhat similar to the reason for the omission of all mention of Responsible Government. You would find it very difficult to come to any conclusions on this subject in this Council. It is impracticable to define now positively what precise tariff would best suit this Country. Some favour a Free Port. I should be inclined to favour it myself if I believed it practicable. Some, on the other hand, say that we must have protection to agriculture, and that without it we cannot compete with the farmers of Oregon. This point was fully discussed in the Executive Council, but it was decided to omit any conditions for the regulation of Customs dues from these terms; and I do not think that this measure ought to be complicated with the tariff question. I believe that we may safely trust this people with whom we are about to negotiate, to do as much for us in this direction as we could do for ourselves; it will be to their interest to do so. It requires no argument to show that it will be to the interest of Canada, after Confederation, to advance the prosperity of this Country. If it be possible to adopt a special tariff to this part of the Colony, and I see no reason why it should not be adopted, I confidently hope to see such a special tariff arranged under Confederation. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos.] Rely upon it, Sir, that there are Statesmen in Canada who have a far wider and longer political experience than Members of this House, and who would be able to point out many means of prosperity, for which we are looking with so much anxiety,—powerful minds, before which I feel humbled,—men who I cannot for a moment suppose would fail to see as plainly as we do that Confederation would be of no benefit to Canada unless it redound to the advantage of British Columbia. This requires no argument, it is perfectly plain common sense.

If we are not to have Confederation, what are we to have? What is the proposition of those who oppose Confederation? The people of this Colony have been, for a long time past, asking for a change, and it has been the policy of those who ask for change to throw the blame of everything upon the Government. The policy of the Imperial Government on this matter is clearly expressed in Earl Granville's despatch. He does not say you must confederate, whether you will or not; it is left to the people to decide this question for themselves; but he says virtually "You have for years been asking for a change, you complain that your present form of Government does not suit you; we point out for your consideration Confederation, which, if it suits you, we favour; the Government of Canada is ready to step in and assist you to carry out your views for the advancement of your local interests." Now, Sir, I say to this Council,—If you don't want Confederation, what do you want? To remain as you are? This I know you are not satisfied to do. What then? Establish a sort of Independent Government of about 6,000 people, connected with nobody, owing allegiance to nobody? The idea is absurd. There appears, then, to be no alternative to Confederation, but that suggestion which has been shadowed forth during this debate, and which I for one decline to consider as a possibility.

And so we come to Confederation as our manifest destiny.

To sum up my argument in support of the motion of the Hon. the Attorney General. I advocate Confederation because it will secure the continuance of this Colony under the British Flag, and strengthen British interests on this Continent; and because it will benefit this community, by lessening taxation and giving increased Revenue for Local Expenditure; by advancing the political status of the Colony; by securing the practical aid of the Dominion Government who are, I believe, able to—and whose special care it would be to devise and—carry into effect measures tending to develop the natural resources, and to promote the prosperity of this Colony; and by affording, through a Railway, the only means of acquiring a permanent population, which must come from the East of the Rocky Mountains.

The Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK said:—Sir, In rising to continue this debate, after the able speech of the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, I feel that there is little left for me to say, as when we go into Committee I shall have an opportunity of expressing my opinion upon the terms; and it would be factious to oppose a measure which has to come before the people for their decision. The way, Sir, that I understand the question of Confederation to stand at present, is that it is not a mere abstract question of Confederation with Canada, but a question of certain terms which have to be laid before the people; therefore, I say that any opposition against this being done would be factious. As regards myself, I shall abide by such decision, whatever it may be, as I consider the people themselves are the best judges as to whether they will benefit, or otherwise, by becoming part and parcel of the Dominion of Canada. This matter has evidently been well considered by the Executive Council, most of whom are largely interested in the welfare of the Colony, and several of them have been as much opposed to immediate Confederation, when the question has been before this Council on other occasions, as I have been. But having had an opportunity of seeing the documents which have come from the Imperial Government on the subject, the Executive have arrived at the decision that it is best for this question to go to the country, upon the assumption that the people will ask for Confederation to be carried out on certain terms; therefore, I say, Sir, let it go to the people and settlers of the Colony, and by their verdict let be decided. Earl Granville has sent out a despatch which states, in pretty plain terms, that we were not able to govern ourselves; and there was, perhaps, more truth than poetry in this; for we have had the greatest liberty granted to us, and yet we have not been content. Our Gold Mining Laws have been made by the Mining Board; we have had the most liberal Land Laws; and if we have had a want that the law could satisfy, it has been immediately granted.

Our Officials are an honour to the country. As an Englishman, I am proud of them. Justice has been properly administered in the country; there has been absolute security to life and property; so much so that a man can travel in perfect safety from Cariboo to Victoria, and capital can be safely invested in any part of the Colony.

We have excellent roads, and one of the richest spots on the whole earth, for our Colony, whether as regards mining wealth, or agricultural resources; and yet a petition has emanated from a small body of foreign residents in the City of Victoria, asking to be annexed to the great Republic adjoining. I am well aware, Sir, that, as has been well said by the Hon. Chief Commissioner, the petition was paltry and unworthy of notice, and that those who signed it were insignificant; and I may be allowed to say that we of the Mainland had no feelings in common with them. If it were within reason to contemplate the possibility of the occurrence of such an alternative, it might be worth while to point out its disadvantages, and to show that under it we should not even have representation, as without a certain population, which we have not, we could not elect a member, and we should fall back to what Washington Territory and Oregon were in the days before this City of Victoria was brought forward by the Fleet, to the encouragement and development of the neighbouring

States, equally, or perhaps in excess of the interests of our own Colony. We may say that liberty had run wild, people have actually become dissatisfied because they have had too much of it. I remember a similar discontent with excess of liberty in Paris, after the Revolution of 1848; the people revelled in excess of freedom, and from so much liberty they fell into another Revolution. It is only in a country with such free institutions as England, that such a petition could have been signed with impunity, for if it means anything at all, it did not stop short of treason. In most other countries the signers would have forfeited their liberty; in some that I have lived in, the penalty would have been death. Speaking for the Mainland, Sir, and coming from the Royal Town of New Westminster, I have a right to speak in the name of its loyal inhabitants. I say that, although Confederation with Canada meets with favour in some quarters, the feelings of the inhabitants are, and ever will be, thoroughly loyal to the glorious flag of Great Britain, and feel proud of belonging to that flag which represents honour, power, justice, and wealth, and which is stainless and untarnished, whether unfurled in the face of an enemy and defended by its sons, or floating in peace over such a Colony as this. We have had our complaints on the Mainland, and we considered the removal of the Capital and centralization of business at Victoria, an injustice to the rest of the Colony, for the reason principally, that Victoria, from its proximity to the United States, draws its supplies thence, instead of from the Mainland, to the gain of the neighbouring States, and consequent loss to the agricultural districts of the Mainland of some $10,000 annually, in the article of beef alone; and for the reason that, by the Fleet being placed at Esquimalt, we of the Mainland were not only left without protection, but that the agricultural interests of Washington Territory and Oregon were being built up with the money expended by the Fleet in the purchase of supplies, which if spent in the valley of the Fraser would, by this time, have given us there a population of some thousands. The people of my part of the Colony have favoured Confederation, in the belief that the resources of the Colony would receive some consideration from the Dominion Government.

We all acknowledge that population is required and I think there is no reason to doubt that it will come. I do not attribute the depression, as some Hon. Members have done, to bad Government. We merely followed the course of other gold countries in over trading, and placed all our dependence upon a single mining district, and when we did not find another Williams Creek, so rapidly as we expected, we became disheartened.

But, Sir, I mean to state, and I do so without fear of contradiction, that our natural resources are more prosperous to day than they have ever been before, and I need only point to the 8,000 acres of land taken up last year as an example of real and solid prosperity. We shall acquire population from Canada by means of the railroad, and the large amount of money required for its construction will tend to our prosperity.

Our merchants also want something fixed, that they may not be threatened with constant change, which renders commerce fluctuating and uncertain.

I consider, Sir, that the time is opportune for Confederation for many reasons, amongst others, that there is a favourable opportunity for us, with the aid of Canada, to make arrangements for the reception of some of the emigrant poor, who are now being assisted by the Societies in England to go out to the Colonies. Work could be found for them on the Railway, and by this means much of our valuable agricultural land might be settled up.

I shall reserve to myself the right of opposing some of the terms when they come under discussion, and of asking that others may be inserted. I should be glad to see inserted in the terms a clause empowering our local Government to make her own tariff, so as to protect our farming interests, in a similar manner as, under the Imperial Government, the Isle of Man and the Channel Islands have rights reserved; but I am of opinion that the full tariff of the Dominion should in all cases be charged, and that the local Government of British Columbia should have the exclusive benefit of any extra tariff.

The Indians, also, should be secured the same protection that they have under our own Government. They are now content with us, and with the way in which the laws are administered, and it is quite possible that they may hereafter be a source of great trouble, if they are not considered as well as white men.

I shall hail with pleasure the salmon laws of Canada, spoken of by one Honourable Member, which will prevent the placing of salmon traps at the mouth of the Fraser, stopping thereby the fish from ascending the river, and by that means cutting off the food of the Indians, and taking from them the means of support; but I should much regret to see any laws brought into operation which would grant monopolies, such for instance as in the case of cranberries, which are at present a source of living to many hundreds of Indians.

As regards our defences: we should have the right to have our own forces, as every one would have to serve in the Militia; but so long as English troops are stationed in Canada, we ought, when we become an integral part of the Dominion, to have our share of them. And at no very distant future, I trust that the great scheme of Confederation may be carried out, and that the Dominion may have a Royal Prince at its head, and then may the views of the great Anglo Saxon race as regards commerce and trade become enlightened so that English goods may come into the Dominion duty free.

As we shall from our position on the Pacific Coast, be the key-stone of Confederation, I hope we may become the most glorious in the whole structure, and tend to our own and England's future greatness.

I shall support the motion of the Honourable the Attorney General.

The Hon. Mr. WOOD said:—Sir, I rise to support the amendment of the Honourable junior Member for Victoria, to postpone the consideration of these Resolutions for six months. I desire, Sir, to express my unqualified opposition to what is termed the Confederation of this Colony with the Dominion of Canada on the basis of the Organic Act; and in dealing with the subject, I shall address myself to three several heads of objection.

Firstly, to the principle of the Organic Act of 1867, as applied to the British North American Provinces;

Secondly, to the special application of the principle to this Colony;

Thirdly, to the mode in which the consent of its adoption is now attempted to be obtained.

Referring for a moment to my own personal position in this Council, I should wish to say that I feel bound as a non-representative and non-official member to present my own views. My mouth is not closed by official reticence, nor do I represent any constituency. I am here, bound by my duty as a Member of this Council, to express my own conscientious views in respect of the measure in explicit terms, in the interests no less of this Colony than of Great Britain, which in this, as in every Colonial question, I cannot but hold to be identical.

With respect to the general principle of Confederation of the British North American Provinces, it will be remembered that, in 1867, I was one of those Members who did vote that Confederation, on fair and equitable terms, was desirable. I am of that opinion still; but my objection is that no terms based on the Organic Act of 1867 can be fair or equitable.

It cannot be denied that the idea of a confederation and general alliance between the British Colonies in North America is a very captivating idea. The existence of a homogeneous nation tending to act as a counterpoise to the great Republic to the south of us, is a grand political idea, but it is an idea most dangerous and difficult to carry out. When I voted in 1867, for Confederation on fair and equitable terms, I had in my mind Confederation in the general acceptation of the word as understood by all political writers, and by the world in general—a union of free and self-governed States, united by a federal compact for purposes of offence and defence, of peace and war; and for the purposes of maintaining and preserving uniformity in laws and institutions which affect the social and commercial relation of life; such laws and institutions as criminal law and practice, the general administration of justice, and the laws regulating commerce and navigation. Such a confederation I then believed to be possible. I am foolish enough to believe it to be possible still; but Confederation as understood by Canadian and Imperial statesmen—Confederation as effected by the Organic Act of 1867—is not Confederation at all. I would, indeed, throw the word Confederation to the winds, since by Confederation is obviously meant union, incorporation, and absorption. The Organic Act of 1867, provides for the entire transfer of all effective legislative power and control to Ottawa, as the seat of the Dominion Government, where, owing to the much

greater wealth and population of Canada, the influence and authority of Canada bear all before it. It is a principle too obvious for proof or dissertation, that Confederation in its proper sense can only thrive where the States bound together by the federal compact are not only free, but where they are nearly equal. Excess of power in any one State is fatal to the interests of the rest. No, Sir, the word Confederation has no application to the intended movement. Lord Granville, in his despatch, no longer calls it by such a term. Union and Incorporation are spoken of, not Confederation, and the movement really is one of incorporation, absorption, and annihilation.

Now, Sir, the objections that I raise are objections to the provisions of the Organic Act, and I find it necessary, for the purposes of my argument, to turn to those provisions. I do not mean to detain the Council at unnecessary length, but as the question before us is one which concerns the future of this Colony for all time, I trust that I shall be excused if I dwell for a few moments upon these points.

If we come into Confederation, we come in, as I understand it, under this Organic Act; and it is on account of the overwhelming influence of Canada in the joint Legislature of the Dominion as given by that Act, that I object to the general principle of the confederation of the North American Provinces of Great Britain. I am told I am in error, that profound Statesmen in Great Britain and in Canada have determined otherwise, and that Confederation, on the basis of the Organic Act of 1867, is the policy of Great Britain.

I regret, Sir, that I cannot be silenced by the weight of such authority. No statesmanship, no conclusion, is of any value except for the reasoning on which it is founded; and I am ready to rest the whole matter on simple argument and reason. All States large enough and populous enough to warrant such privileges, eugerly and passionately desire the power of self-government. It is the common passion of our race. Formerly, even now, in other places, it is British policy to give these powers; and as New South Wales has thrown off Victoria and Queensland, so would it appear to be reasonable to extend the principle to the British Provinces in North America, rather than to adopt a different policy, for the simple reason that it is in accordance with the instincts of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the just rights of man.

We want self-government, which means the protection of our own interests, and the establishment of our own welfare in our own way; the passing of our own Estimates in our own way; the selection of those who rule, and the subsequent meeting of our rulers, face to face, in open Council, that they may show us the results of their ruling. It means the imposition and collection of our own taxes, fostering our own industries, and the power of the purse. These are the elements of self-government, and they are reserved to the Dominion Government, and taken from the Provinces; hence my objections to the Organic Act. For these reasons I say that Confederation—or rather union—with Canada cannot be fair and equal, on account of the overwhelming influence of Canada in the Dominion Parliament, now and in the future, for it always must be so. Canada can extend, and will extend, and even of herself would be able to sway the destinies of the Dominion. And are we to accept this position because we are told that British statesmanship wills it. Stat smanship, Sir, is nothing more than very sound common sense put into practice—sound common sense, backed by a knowledge of mankind and of the subject matter to which that statesmanship is applied. And, although it is not for me to depreciate the renown of my countrymen, it cannot be disguised that they have not unfrequently gone astray, and been forced to submit to the control of national interests and national will. It is not difficult to find instances of error in British statesmanship as applied to Colonial affairs. The errors of British Statesmen, with a majority of the House of Commons and the British Nation to back them, cost Great Britain the thirteen United States. The errors of British Statesmen, with a majority of the House of Commons and the British Nation to back them, have inflicted wrongs upon Ireland, which are only now in process of removal; and the policy of British Statesmen, with the British Nation to back it, has created a difference which has gone far to alienate the affections of the Colonists of New Zealand.

In this question of Confederation it is impossible not to see the self-interest of Great Britain underlying the whole matter. England is alarmed at the extent of her Colonial Possessions, and her obligations to protect them by sea and land. Of all her possessions, the Dominion of Canada is the most assailable; and, doubtless, Great Britain stands alarmed at the responsibility and cost of protecting so enormous a frontier. The question of Confederation is the question of every tax-paying Englishman, and whatever may be the *reasoning* put forth, the *motive* is economy and security to the tax-paying public of Great Britain. Confederation is, doubtless, of value to Great Britain, as establishing a counterpoise to the United States of America, and probably inducing the Dominion of Canada to ask for and obtain independence, and so relieve the Mother Country from the cost and duty of defending it. This is, I believe, the entire *Statesmanship* of the measure—a Statesmanship meritorious in English eyes—but, as I believe, fraught with extreme danger to British interests in this quarter of the globe.

Turning now, to what may be called the argument in favor of Confederation, we have Lord Granville's despatch. Lord Granville, it must be admitted, has ably, gracefully, and plausibly put before us the supposed advantages of Confederation:—"Her Majes-"ty's Government believe that a Legislature selected "from an extended area, and representing a diversity "of interests, was more likely to deal more compre-"hensively with large questions, and more impartially "with small questions, and more conclusively with "both, than is possible when controversies are "carried on and decided upon in the comparatively "narrow circle in which they arise. Questions of "purely local interest would be more carefully and "dispassionately considered when disengaged from "the larger politics of the Country, and at the same "time would be more sagaciously considered by "persons who have had this larger political educa-"tion.

"Finally, they anticipate that the interests of every "Province of British North America would be more "advanced by enabling the wealth, credit and intel-"ligence of the whole to be brought to bear on every "part, than by encouraging each in the contracted "policy of taking care of itself, possibly at the ex-"pense of its neighbour." This I understand to be the argument of the Colonial Office in favour of Confederation; and although I fully admit that it is well put, I believe that no argument is more fallacious. It is delicate ground for me to touch when I presume to differ from what comes from so able a man. On this point I wish to make myself distinctly understood. I do not profess to be a statesman or a politician, but as a lawyer of mature age, pretending to a fair share of common sense and a knowledge of human nature, I will venture to say, that if there is one passion more powerful in the minds of Colonists of Anglo-Saxon origin than another, it is the passion for self-government; in all English communities there is an ardent passion for self-government. Colonists here, as everywhere else, are animated by an intense desire to govern themselves in the way they think best, and to delegate that power to others is destructive of every feeling of self respect and of social and political liberty.

It is not necessary for me to prove that this is the case, it is too notorious for comment; and as long as the spirit of liberty exists in the British Nation we shall find that no one Province will submit to legislation at the hands of a Legislature in which its interests and welfare are overwhelmed and overborne. To secure submission to a Legislature such as that of the Dominion of Canada, where the majority of the Canadian Members make the law, unitormity of interest and feeling is necessary; and not only will the feeling of any separate Province be wounded by the consciousness that self-government is withheld from it, but on finding that its interests, or its feelings, are overwhelmed and subjected to the interests and feelings of a dominant portion, the sense of discontent and dissatisfaction will become universal and national, hence will ensue a condition of things most perilous to British interests generally.

The bond of union between Canada and the other Provinces bears no resemblance to the union between England and her Colonial Possessions. There is no natural love and original feeling of loyalty. The feeling of loyalty towards England is a feeling blind, instinctive, strong, born with us and impossible to be shaken off; and I believe it is impossible to transfer a feeling of loyalty and fealty at will. The connection between the Mother Country and a Colony, even a Crown Colony, is well understood in principle and in practice. The Mother Country guarantees the Colony from enemies abroad, and the entire work of inter-colonial management is, except in matters of prerogative, left to the Colonists themselves. The

Crown pretends to no dictation, nor has it any interest at variance with the interests of the Colonists. Although in a Crown Colony the Official element is supreme, it is well understood that it is to govern—and public opinion forces it to govern—according to the well understood and well established wishes of the Colony at large. The Government can not and dare not interfere except to prevent crude, irrational, or vicious legislation. There is no direct conflict between the Mother Country and a Colony in these days; but it cannot be supposed that any British Province will submit patiently to injustice at the hands of a Canadian Ministry or a Canadian House of Commons. If any scheme has been devised more likely than another to raise and keep alive local irritation it is, in my judgment, the scheme of Confederation on the basis of the Organic Act of 1867.

What is said by Lord Granville is true in theory, but practically it is opposed to human nature; and in endeavouring to carry out elaborate and elevated views Great Britain stands a fair chance of losing the whole of British North America.

Thus far I have treated of the general policy of the Organic Act.

With respect to the applicability of the scheme of Confederation to this Colony I have more special and particular grounds of objection. I consider such an union inexpedient on several grounds.

First, the remoteness of the Colony from Canada;

Secondly, the comparative insignificance of British Columbia;

And, thirdly, the diversity of its interests from those of Canada.

That these objections specially apply to the extension of the principle to this Colony no one can doubt. Lord Granville admits that the distance is an objection, but thinks that a Railway will annihilate time and space. He thinks that the Government can be carried on at a distance of 3,000 miles without difficulty. This Railway is to bridge over the vast desert that intervenes between this Colony and Ottawa. The notion that we can with any effect represent the interests of this Colony in the Parliament at Ottawa at a distance of 3,000 miles is to me absurd. With a population such as ours, even if we have the representation suggested by the terms, with eight Members of Parliament against one hundred and eighty-two, and four senators against seventy-two, how can it be supposed to be possible that our voices could be heard? When Lord Granville spoke of "comprehensiveness" and "impartiality" in a Legislature, surely he must have lost sight of the constituent elements of a House of Commons. For let us consider, without any reflection upon the House of Commons at Ottawa, what is the nature of the House of Commons of England, or of any other assembly of the same nature. Every House of Commons is but an assemblage of the Members of Parliament pledged to support the material interests of their constituents, whenever these interests are affected. I never can anticipate anything but the representation of the views and the material interests of constituents in any House of Commons. I believe that members would always vote according to the interests of men whose votes they would have again to solicit, and of whose interests public opinion holds them to be the acknowledged advocates.

How can we find eight men in a place like this, where at all events the most valuable members of society are professional and business men, without selecting them from a class who are politicians by profession? Most men here are workers of some sort, and actively employed in their several professions and businesses, and we should have extreme difficulty in finding eight good men who would spare the time and expense to go to Ottawa. What we should want would be such men as are now at Ottawa, the principal business men, bankers, merchants, and professional men; but time and space will prevent this most valuable class of men from leaving British Columbia and representing our interests at Ottawa, and we shall be compelled either to retain the services of Canadian gentlemen, who, living in Canada, would be British Columbian representatives only in name, or we should have to take eight representatives who will be content to make politics a profession, and we shall have to pay them for their services. To the insignificance of British Columbia as a Province of the Dominion the same remarks apply.

Difference of interests is a still more material point. Upon this point direct conflict is sure to arise. Canada belongs to the Atlantic, and looks to the Old World for her markets. We are a new country, our staples are totally different. Questions cannot but arise between British Columbia and Canada—between the East and the West—in which Canadian interests will prevail over those of British Columbia; and aggravated by the feeling of wounded pride and forced insignificance, the Colonists of British Columbia will feel naturally aggrieved.

The Colonial feeling is well known—pride and attachment to the Mother Country and intense sensitiveness and tenacity where injustice or wrong is done. Once let this feeling be roused amongst us and it will not be long before British Columbia is clamorous for repeal; and not obtaining it, the Country will be ripe for any other change, however violent.

Now, Sir, with respect to the third head of my objections. With respect to the mode in which the consent of this Colony is attempted to be obtained, I am sorry to notice what I cannot but call a spirit of diplomacy, and a spirit of management, characterizing the whole movement in favour of Confederation on the part of the Imperial Government. It is obvious throughout that the Imperial Government desires to obtain their end and aim of Confederation in a mercantile spirit of bargain and sale, which jars upon my feelings of right and wrong.

If this Council is properly the Legislature of British Columbia; if we reflect the intelligence, the substance, and the interests of the Colony, we ought to have originated these Resolutions ourselves. The matter should have arisen spontaneously amongst us, without any attempt at leading or forcing. What may be His Excellency's own views upon the subject of Confederation we cannot tell. I look upon Lord Granville's despatch as a diplomatic order, couched in polite language, but nevertheless a requirement to the Governor to carry out the will of the Colonial Office, without reference to his own convictions. All that we are told by His Excellency upon this subject is that the Colony will derive "material benefit" from Confederation, and the Colony has been offered by the Executive certain material benefits in the shape of a Railway, a Dock, cash in hand, and freedom from debt, in return for the transfer of all legislation to the Dominion of Canada. These "material benefits" being paraded before the eyes of the Colonists, the bargain is afterwards to be accepted or refused by a Council composed mainly of Representative Members. This mode of operation, no less than the bargain itself, is equally objectionable in my eyes. The material benefits—the Dock, the Railway, the money payments—are in effect nothing more than bribes to the present generation to forego the rights of self-government.

I have no doubt that the Colony will accept the bargain. The Colony is a small one, the population not exceeding 6,500 adult white men, and of these many are gentlemen of Canadian proclivities, Canadians by birth, who are naturally, and I may say patriotically, in favour of a union with their native Country.

There are many, also, who in the present adverse condition of things in this Colony, are desirous of change of any kind, and eager for any opportunity of benefitting by operations which promise to throw population, capital, and enterprise into the Colony. We have suffered much from pecuniary depression, and when we have an offer from a great Country to come and spend money among us, can you doubt that any one will fail to feel these advantages; while many more hope for political power and eminence in a system which they expect will carry with it Representative Institutions, if not Responsible Government. Can we doubt that the vote will be in favour of Confederation? The people of this Country will sell themselves for the consideration of the present, and posterity will hereafter ask indignantly what right had we to shackle them, and to deprive them of rights which cannot be sold.

We shall reap the benefit, and those that come after us will reap the disadvantage and humiliation. It is not in the power of the present generation to dispose of the birthright of its descendants. Liberty and self-government are inalienable rights. The original vice of the matter still remains, and when once the material benefits are enjoyed or forgotten, and the consciousness of disadvantage is apparent, reaction will set in; a party of repudiators and repealers will arise, who with great show of justice will clamorously demand the reversal of an organic change, founded on political error and wrong. Although our masters at Ottawa may be ever so amiable and ever so pure, the moment we feel the yoke we shall repent; it is not in the nature

of Englishmen to submit to tyranny of any description; and dissent such as our posterity will express, will be on only too sound grounds. I say, Sir, that this matter ought not to be brought forward now, when the country is in a state of depression, ready to catch at anything. Recourse should not be now had to Representative Institutions for the first time, when the obvious effect is the acceptance by this Colony of a confederation which carries with it direct, immediate, pecuniary gain. Few have the self-denial to reject a bait so invitingly dangled before their eyes. If the Colonists are to be trusted with Representative Institutions, for the purpose of effecting so important and radical a constitutional change, why are they not to be trusted with Representative Institutions altogether? It is notorious that the Colony is, probably with justice, considered by the Imperial Authorities unfit for full Representative Institutions, and that a Council, with a predominant official element within it, is the only fit body to deal with important questions. Yet this Council is to be differently constituted, and the ultimate terms to be accepted by the people alone, for the sole purpose of forwarding the cause of Confederation. The whole scheme for effecting Confederation is but a scheme of temptation very difficult to forego, though it must be admitted recourse is not had to actual or practical force and obligation.

I have delivered my honest opinion on this matter, *liberavi animam meam*. I fear at great length. But I have spoken according to my conscientious convictions and a spirit of the truest loyalty. I am desirous to promote the interests of the British Nation; and I believe the present movement puts them in great peril. I have given you the best proof of my sincerity. I have spoken against my own interests. I have material interests in this Colony which will greatly benefit by the movement which will ensue from the building of a Railroad and a Dock. The interests of friends and connections who are dear to me will be much benefitted; and those who know the world tell me that it would have been better for me if I had bent before the storm which I cannot avoid; that the honours and rewards of my profession are not likely to be bestowed upon one who is no friend to a popular, an Imperial, and a Canadian movement; but I cannot act against political conviction. I am here to give honest council, and I have done it, come what may.

The question has always appeared to me to be this:—Confederation with England which we have; Confederation in its truest sense; Confederation with all the security of protection, and all the pride of self-government, now or hereafter to be, when the Colony shall have population and wealth sufficient: or Confederation—or as it should be termed "Incorporation" with Canada. Incorporation with a country to which we are bound by no natural tie of affection or duty, and remote in geographical position, and opposed to us in material interests. Incorporation with all the humiliation of dependence, and to my mind the certainty of reaction, agitation, and discontent. Canada can never become the *assignee*, the *official assignee*, the *Downing Street official assignee* of the affection and loyalty which exists between this dependency and the Mother Country. I am opposed to the political extinction of this Colony, and its subservience to the will of a majority of the House of Commons at Ottawa, and the administration of its affairs by the political adherents of Canadian Statesmen. And all this for what? For "material benefits," for a money consideration, in which the ring of the dollar only faintly conceals the clink of the fetter. I am grieved at the mode in which the change is sought to be effected, and view the bargain and sale of political independence for ourselves and our descendants for a few dollars in hand, and a few dollars in the future, as equally shameful and void.

Railway or no Railway—consent or no consent—the transfer of Legislative power to Ottawa, to a place so remote in distance and in interest, is an injustice and a political extravagance which time will most surely establish.

The Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS, Member for Victoria District, then rose and said:—Mr President, I congratulate you, Sir, and this House upon the noble work on which we are engaged. We are engaged, I believe, in Nation-making. For my part I have been engaged in Nation-making for the last twelve years—ever since I have been engaged in politics in the Colony. [Hon. Registrar General—"You have not made a Nation yet."] The Hon. Registrar General says that I have not made a Nation yet. I need only, in reply, quote for his enlightenment the old adage "Rome was not built in a day." [Laughter.] In the humble part that I have taken in politics, I have ever had one end in view. I have seen three Colonies united on the Pacific Coast. [Hon. Mr. Helmcken—"Three?"] Yes, three: Sitkin, British Columbia, and Vancouver Island; and if I had had my way, instead of the United States owning Alaska, it would have been British to-day. I have advocated the union of those three Colonies, and in the union of two of them particularly, I have taken a prominent part. For many years I have regarded the union of the British Pacific Territories, and of their consolidation under one Government, as one of the steps preliminary to the grand consolidation of the British Empire in North America. I still look upon it in this light with the pride and feeling of a native-born British American. From the time when I first mastered the institutes of physical and political geography I could see Vancouver Island on the Pacific, from my home on the Atlantic; and I could see a time when the British Possessions, from the United States boundary to the Arctic Ocean, and extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, would be consolidated into one great Nation.

Sir, my political course has been unlike that of most others in this Colony. Allow me to illustrate my meaning by the use of another old adage. My course has been that of "beating the bush whilst others caught the bird." My allegiance has been to principle, and the only reward I have asked or sought has been to see sound political principles in operation. Therefore, Sir, I say again that I congratulate you and this Honourable House on the noble work on which we are all engaged.

We are here, Sir, laying the corner stone of a great Nation on the Pacific Coast. When we look at past history, we find some Nations that date their origin in the age of fable: some have been produced by violence, and extended their empire by conquest. But we are engaged in building up a great Nation in the noon-day light of the nineteenth century, not by violence, not by wrong, but I hope, Sir, by the exercise of that common sense which the Honourable gentleman who preceded me called statesmanship.

It was not my intention yesterday to have taken up the attention of this House with any remarks until we were in Committee of the Whole, although I have taken, for historical purposes, ample notes of the debate. Allusions have, however, been made during the course of this debate, amongst others to myself. I am, therefore, compelled to crave the indulgence of the House for a time to set myself right before this Council and the Country, and to add my humble opinion to those around me in favour of the consideration of this question in Committee of the Whole. I shall support the general principle of Confederation, [Hear, hear.] as I have always done, if we get to the discussion of the terms proposed.

First, Sir, let me allude to some of the statements of the Honourables the Attorney General (Mr. Crease) and the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works (Mr. Trutch) and to the Honourable Executive Member for Victoria City (Mr. Helmcken.) Sir, I know something about the history of Confederation. Up to the opening of this Session, Confederation has been a subject of agitation. It may properly be divided into several heads: firstly, agitation; secondly, negotiation; thirdly, inauguration; and fourthly, I hope, successful operation. Now, Sir, it is apparent that every act of mine in reference to Confederation, up to the time it was announced in Earl Granville's despatch, up to the time His Excellency the Governor sent down his Message—every act of mine was in the line of agitation. It was with the view to bring about the consideration of terms with the Dominion Government; to hear what they would do; to bring the question before the people, and to canvass its defects and advantages that I for one have agitated the question. In doing so I have come in for blows from open enemies and treason from false political friends. Sir, the era of agitation has now passed, and we advance to the era of negotiation.

When I heard the Hon. Attorney General, yesterday, invoking High Heaven; and when I heard him explaining the position of Official Members upon this question; when I heard him state that he was always in favour of Confederation, there flashed across my mind one of the proverbs of Solomon, which I cannot refrain from repeating: "Such is the way of an adulterous woman; she eateth and wipeth her mouth and saith I have done no wickedness." [Laughter.] Sir, I respect any Hon. Member who will, if he sees reason to change his opinion, come down and frankly tell the honest truth; but when an Hon. Member tries

to make political capital out of other men's labour, I confess I do not respect him. On the contrary, such men as the latter, when Officers of a Government, remind me of the remark of a celebrated French philosopher, who said: "That in all the mysterious ways of Providence there is nothing so inscrutable as his purpose in committing the destiny of nations to such creatures as these." [Laughter].

There are men in this Colony entitled to some honour; some men who are entitled to praise for having brought Confederation to its present stage; but they are not the Honourable Gentleman, the Minister of Justice, nor the Honourable the Chief Commissioner. [Hear, hear.]

Is Earl Granville entitled to the credit of bringing this matter forward? Is Governor Musgrave, or his Cabinet, or the Officials? No, Sir, I should be doing wrong if I permitted it to be supposed that the credit was due to any one of them. I have assisted to make history, and this is a page of it. Let it go forth to the world, that the people of this country have made Confederation the important question that it is to-day.

The Hon. Chief Commissioner, whom we have heard with so much pleasure to-day, made an allusion to me. He said that when I brought this matter before the Council in 1868, that the Executive Council opposed Confederation then, and the present terms proved their wisdom in delaying the question at that time. On that occasion my object was only agitation to open negotiations. But, Sir, what did I hear at that time? "You pension the officials and we will all vote for Confederation," and I think I could mention another Executive Councillor who said: "Do you think we are such fools as to vote for Confederation without being provided for?" That was the kind of wisdom in vogue in 1868. Sir, I again object to Hon. Members taking credit where no credit is due. [Hear, hear.]

Let us turn now to the Honourable Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken), once a warm and generous friend to Confederation; and what has been the result of his opposition? Impotence. He was impotent to retard the question. He was impotent to advance it. By impotent, I mean powerless. He was impotent to stem the course of events. He hung out the banner of Anti-Confederation in Victoria, and won his seat by crying "down with Confederation." Before he contested the seat with me, I told him that the Canadian Government would not negotiate until the North-West Territory question was settled. Yet the Hon. Member for Victoria City charged me with backing down from Confederation.

The Hon. Member for New Westminster, also, denounced me in his elegant English in the *Columbian* as giving up the cause of Confederation. But, Sir, why did I say that the Canadian Government would not enter into negotiations with us? It was because I had in my pocket, at the time, a despatch from a Canadian Cabinet Minister, which said that the Dominion Government would not negotiate until the questions then pending with respect to the North-West Territory were settled. The Hon. Member for Victoria City, held up, however, his puny arm against Confederation. But has he stopped it? No! Not a day, nor an hour; for as soon as the North-West Territory question was settled, then came a despatch to the Governor to push on Confederation. I think I have said enough, Sir, to show that it was the people who took this matter in hand, and it is the people who will carry it through. [Hear, hear.]

Although I have risen unprepared to make a set speech, there are still some points raised in debate which, in my opinion, require attention.

The Hon. Attorney General, after opening his budget upon Confederation, has referred to the three courses which these terms had to take:—First, they are to be arranged by this House; next, to go to the Canadian Government; and, thirdly, to be ratified by the people of this Colony.

I hope, Sir, that this House will deal with these terms in the interests of British Columbia. I stand here not as a Canadian, but as a British Columbian; my allegiance is due first to British Columbia. I sincerely hope that these terms will be dealt with from a British Columbian point of view, [Hear, hear, hear, hear.] and first as to the money value of Confederation. [Hear, hear, from Dr. Helmcken.] It may grate on the ear of the once Solicitor General (Mr. Wood) to mention money; but, Sir, I believe in the old adage that: "Money makes the mare to go." I do not intend to allude to the terms in the Resolutions at present, any further than to say, that I do not believe in going into Confederation without good terms. I believe that it would be traitorous to British Columbia to consent to Confederation without good terms; and that we would not do our duty if we did not insist upon getting them.

The Hon. Attorney General asks why we are not prosperous? In my opinion, Sir, the causes of our want of prosperity are various. They first arose under the administration of Sir James Douglas in 1858, and have been perpetuated down to the present day. The people were then almost driven away, and down to the present time the Government have done nothing comparatively to induce population to settle in the Colony. Another reason is, that the country is somewhat rugged, and not so attractive for settlement as some others. The Hon. Member for Victoria City, says, that it is our proximity to the United States. I most respectfully deny it. Population would have come if greater efforts had been made to get it. The Hon Attorney General is consistent in one thing. He said in 1867, and he says in his speech now, that British Columbia is of vital importance to Canada. I cannot see it. I cannot see why the Canadian Railway, if this was a foreign country and our boundary coterminous with that of Canada, might not have run through to connect with our railway system, as the French railways connect with those of Belgium.

When sitting in the Vancouver Island House of Assembly, in the place now occupied by the Hon. Chief Commissioner, I defined British Colonists to be politically, nothing but subordinate Englishmen; and I contend, Sir, that Confederation will give us equal political rights with the people of Great Britain. In labouring for this cause, Sir, my idea has been and is to assist in creating a nationality—a sovereign and independent nationality.

Now, I come to the Hon. Member for Victoria City again. I really confess, Mr. President, that I expected more sterling opposition from that Hon. gentleman. I thought we had here the modern Charles Martel, the celebrated armed warrior who had gone out to drive the Saracens—the Canadians—back across the Rocky Mountains. I thought that he would have protested like Paul the Protestant. [Dr. Helmcken, What became of St. Paul?] Paul was converted, and I hope the Hon. Member may share the same fate. [Laughter.] I expected the Hon. Member to have delivered a philippic, that would have done honour to Demosthenes when declaiming against Philip of Macedon. But, I really don't know but what he has been set up as a target by the Government—a man of straw—to draw the shot of all the Confederate party. I don't know why he was taken into the Executive Council. I thought that this Council was an united and impenetrable phalanx, but it seems that it is otherwise. What a happy family that Executive Council must be! The Member for Cariboo and the Member for the City differ in their views, and both differ in this House from the Honourable Executive Councillors at the other end of the table. It is like Barnum's happy family. But the Honourable gentleman has told us some things which are good, and besides that he is going to raise other issues.

[Dr. Helmcken—"I?"]

Yes, the Honourable Gentleman said that the issue would be raised at the next election, between going to Canada and going somewhere else.

[Dr. Helmcken—"I said that I thought it very probable if mean terms were proposed by Canada, the people whould raise other issues."]

O! "the people," those much abused words. I believe in the people when they are right. But the Honourable gentleman *did* threaten to raise the issue of going somewhere else. Now, Sir, where else except to Canada could we go? The Honourable Member talks of agricultural interests, why, Sir, by going somewhere else these interests, from Comox to Sooke, and from Soda Creek and Kamloops to the Lower Fraser, would be destroyed; the country would be flooded by produce from the United States. From Comox to Sooke, from the delta of the Fraser to Cariboo, the farming interests would be destroyed by going somewhere else. If that question came up, Sir, the farmers would quickly put it down. The Honourable Member for Victoria City says that the question comes here by desire of Her Majesty's Government. Sir, I say again that it comes here by desire of the people, a large proportion of whom have asked Her Majesty's Government, and the Government at Ottawa, to bring it here. I am thankful that the question of Confederation is here. The Honourable gentlemen says it is a Government measure, and that the terms must be passed. I say again that I hope terms will be passed of such a character as will contribute to the prosperity and happiness of this Colony. The Honourable Executive Councillor says

that this is a Government measure, and that it ought to be an open question. Why does he not retire from his seat then? I would not be a candidate for his place. [Dr. Helmcken—"There are no candidates. The Executive Council are appointed."]

Then I am sorry for the choice that has been made. Why, Sir, the programme settled by Government, would leave it virtually an open question by referring the terms to a popular vote. I may have something to say upon that hereafter. How patriotic will the Honourable gentleman be when he goes outside, and says that this nominative Council, presided over by a paid Colonial Secretary, have done this! How very easy it is for an Honourable gentleman to talk about the autocracy of Government, when it suits him to do so. Look at his conduct in voting supplies. When my Honourable friend on my left (the Member for Lillooet) tried to bring in a Bill to repeal the Crown Salaries Acts, was he not choked off by the Honourable member for Victoria City objecting first? But I am only delaying the House. [Hear, hear.] The Honourable Magisterial member for Victoria City says, "hear, hear." Now, Sir, as far as I am concerned the Honourable member has my full permission to withdraw. [Laughter.] I have always been ready to take a British subject vote on this question; but the Honourable member for Victoria has always dissented from that proposal.

The Honourable member for Victoria City has a remarkable way of putting things. But a few days ago he stated in this House, that if the people will only support the Government in getting the terms proposed, all will be right. I quote from the Colonist newspaper of 20th February, 1870, in which the Honourable gentleman is made to say, "I hope the people will support the Government in trying to get terms." He now comes down here and opposes them. [Dr. Helmcken—"I don't oppose the terms, I oppose Confederation."] A distinction without a difference. The Honourable Executive Councillor says the time is inopportune. I say, Sir, that now is the time. If the new gold discoveries, which have been mentioned in the course of this debate, really exist, now is the time to confederate, and to take means to attract and retain population. I, Sir, have spent five years of my life in the mining districts of California, and have helped to build up town after town; but how are they now? Many of those towns which had their 5,000 inhabitants have almost none now. It will be the same with our gold-mining towns. I fear the Honourable gentleman will always say the time is inopportune, not only before the population arrives, but when it is here, and after it goes. If we can make a good bargain with Canada, by all means let us make it, and make it now. I like the word bargain, it sounds like business. What did the Honourable member for Victoria say at the last election? "Don't let us have Confederation, for we shall have a surplus revenue of $100,000 in 1869, and we will do better without Confederation." Confederation was inopportune then. There was a large deficit or falling off in the Revenue for 1869, and yet he says it is inopportune now. He said, yesterday, we shall have a reduction of the public debt in 1873, of about $36,000, and by funding the floating debt make another saving of $15,000 per year. So that for a paltry saving of $50,000 three years hence, the confederation question is now inopportune. I am suprised at the Honourable gentleman. First, it is inopportune, because of the present depression; second, inopportune at the last election, because things looked so bright; thirdly, inopportune now, because we can save $50,000. Your predecessor as Minister of Finance, Mr. President, promised great things, but the Governor's Message with the Estimates shows how they have turned out. I do not deal in prophesy, but in facts. Let any one look at Cariboo. Look at Victoria. If we wait for the time to be opportune, we may wait until it is too late. Suppose any unforeseen accident were to happen to our gold mines. If the golden spring is dried up, the golden stream that now flows from Cariboo to Victoria will be dried up also. We are asked by the Honourable member for Victoria to wait for the census of 1871. What has the census of Canada to do with the question? The basis of population as set forth in these terms is all fiction. It does not come up to my idea of nation-making. Why not deal with facts? Why set up some legal fiction of John Doe and Richard Roe? I want facts not fiction. Let us base our financial calculations upon facts, and the rest will work itself out satisfactorily. Much has been said, during the debate, about the Red River Territory and its settlement. For my part I don't care if the Red River difficulty is never settled, so far as it bears on the question before the Council. I believe that the Red River country, and the valley of the two Saskatchewans are not so favorable for settlement as some amongst us are accustomed to assert. But whether the North-west Territory is confederated or not, I go in for Confederation, because I believe we can make terms, and good terms, with Canada. The Honourable member for Victoria City talks of the drawbacks to Confederation arising out of the vast extent of country, and our great distance from the seat of the Federal Government. That will hardly scare anybody, with the example of the United States before us. Next he says that the Dominion is only an experiment, and that it may break up. How often have I heard people predict that the United States, as a nation, must break up, as it was only an experiment. Why, Sir, they forget that the States had existed as separate Governments for one hundred and fifty years before their union. So with the Provinces of the Dominion of Canada, they existed as separate Governments for the last hundred to two hundred years, and Confederation is but the application of long tried principles to a larger territory. Why did not the Honourable member for Victoria City, when he said there were defects in the confederation machine, tell us what the great defects in the machine were? He has merely raised up a scarecrow. Then he says it is absurd to ally ourselves to people who were 3,000 miles away; but nothing in his argument showed me that the absurdity was proven. I remember, Sir, when the communication between California and Washington, was by Panama and Nicaragua; was California then less to the United States than now? We now can hold communication with Ottawa, by San Francisco and the Pacific Railroad, and will be as near to our central Government as Washington Territory. The Honourable member speaks of people 3,000 miles away, being unable to do as well for us as we could do for ourselves. I believe they could do just as well so far as some general principles are concerned, if we only settled the conditions properly. With regard to the States of the neighbouring Republic getting on better than the Provinces or ourselves, I would ask where is the progress of Washington Territory as compared with our own country? [Dr. Helmcken—"It contains a much larger population."] The population is only five thousand voters!

The Honourable gentleman is pursuing the same devious course as he did in past years, when he opposed reform, when our Government might have been beneficial to the Colony, had it been based on the popular will. He says that the deposition of the Free Port drove people out of the Colony. I take this occasion to state that, in my belief, the deposition of the Free Port was the commencement of the permanent prosperity of this City; and brought in its train the dawning of prosperity throughout the whole district, from Comox to Sooke, which includes the district which I have the honour to represent, and which now numbers six hundred voters, all of whom are prosperous. There, Sir, lies the key-stone of Confederation! If the terms between British Columbia and Canada do not protect the farming interests, the largest and the only permanent interest in this Colony, Confederation will do no good. If it does not protect the farming interest, I vote against Confederation, first, last, and all the time.

It would be most unwise to join Canada without protection. We must have a control over certain imports in the terms, for a protective tariff is the only inducement to farmers to remain upon the soil. We depend upon them to build up a permanent interest in the country, that will last for ever.

We most certainly do want extension of commerce, but the true mode to obtain extension is to add to its volume internally. First, I believe in developing internal trade and industry; next, I believe in external trade. Allow these terms as brought down by the Government to pass, and in a few years you will reduce Victoria to the position of a mere smuggling village. Protection is a necessity. So long as there are nations and national interests, so long will it be necessary to have laws to protect those interests. Allow me, Sir, on this point to say that there is a great revolution in the value of realty, capital, and labour commencing on the Pacific Coast. The equalisation of the value of realty, capital, and labour has commenced. The whole tendency of events in the countries to the south of us, is to equalize the value of labour, of real estate, of capital, of manufactures, and of produce on this Coast with their value on the Atlantic side. No such revolution in values has ever occurred on the Pacific

Coast, except that produced by the discovery of gold, as has been produced since the opening of the Pacific railroad. Take off protection then from our farmers, and they are reduced to the condition of the agriculturists to the south of us, who will be reduced to the condition of those in the east. No doubt the prices of our farmers will be reduced by the revolution that is going on, but give them protection against foreign competition, and there will still be inducement for them to remain. The Hon. Chief Commissioner referred to this in a very proper spirit; and the Hon. Member for New Westminster says that it is one of the most important questions. I hope, therefore, that the subject will have due weight with them.

The Government of Canada, according to the proposed terms, would give us a surplus revenue of $200,000. [Dr. Helmcken, "No."] The Hon. Member says no. He may be right. But upon the calculation that we shall have $200,000 surplus revenue, I say that this subsidy will be equivalent to four hundred farmers, who earn in the Colony $500 each, annually. By taking off protection from our farmers, to get the $200,000, we would injure the country instead of benefitting it. But get the surplus of $200,000, and at the same time protection for our farmers, and we will do a prosperous business under Confederation. This is what we have to arrange. What we have to get into the terms. [Dr. Helmcken, "All right! I will help you."] I would say that "extremes meet," for I now meet my Hon. friend (I mean political enemy) ["No, no,"] to secure protection. I do not see, with the Hon. Member for Victoria City, that we can get all we want without Confederation by a judicious arrangement of our own tariff. I can show, that what we want most in this Colony, is population, and that population employed in a remunerative manner. Isolation will not secure population. Confederation on proper terms will give us population; will give us means to employ labour remuneratively; will enlarge our commerce, and build up our industry. If it gives us public works,—if it give us a railroad from a point on the Fraser, below Yale, to Savona's Ferry on Lake Kamloops,—and if we connect Lake Okanagan with the Spel-mah-cheen River, by railway, which is only about thirteen miles,—not only will the whole country from Osoyoos Lake, on the boundary, behind the Cascades, be opened up and connected with our chief commercial city, with a cheap and speedy means of transportation; but all this tract of country traversed by the railways and lake communication will be utilized in producing wheat and wool, and other articles for exportation. Victoria, then, will be built up, and will be the chief commercial city of British Columbia, with all other parts of the Colony tributary to her. This is what Confederation on proper terms will do for us. The Hon. Member for Victoria said, that no lasting union could be maintained, unless the interests of British Columbia are preserved. If I look (for argument sake) at these things from a Canadian point of view, I find that by serving the interests of British Columbia, the interests of Canada will be served. Canada, as well as British Columbia, will benefit by a protective duty here. Canada will get the revenue under protection, and British Columbia will have its industry protected from foreign competition. And, there is no reason that we should not have our interests protected. [Dr. Helmcken—"The Organic Act says no."] The Organic Act says no such thing. Confederation is diversity in unity: really and essentially a general unity, and an application of law to diverse interests. First, we find that New Brunswick, under the Organic Act, gets a temporary subsidy of $63,000 per annum. None of the other Provinces receive any temporary subsidy under that Act. New Brunswick is allowed to collect export dues on lumber. All the other Provinces are prohibited from levying dues on lumber. Now, if New Brunswick gets an additional subsidy, and levies a lumber tax prohibited to the other Provinces, why cannot British Columbia get exemption from uniformity in her favour? Nova Scotia gets two subsidies, equal to $160,000, which are not in the Organic Act. The Crown lawyers say that the grant is not unconstitutional. This is a noted exception, made to satisfy the Nova Scotia repeal party. Another exception is found in the compulsory provision, that appointments to the Judiciary shall be made from the Bar of the Provinces for which the appointment is made, till the laws and practice are assimilated. If the Organic Act is wrong, I say change the Act. But, I believe, that I have successfully shown that exceptions have been and can be made under the Organic Act.

Now, let us see what this horrible Canadian tariff is. It is too high on cattle for us; not high enough on bacon, butter, cheese, and lard by a few cents; and imposes nothing on hay, hops, and grain of all kinds. I explained the whole to my constituents, at eleven meetings, and they said, get these few alterations made to suit us, and we will support Confederation. So we must have an alteration. Why, Sir, under the English Constitution different tariffs can be imposed. Look at the difference in the Excise spirit duties that were levied formerly in Scotland and England, for instance. As a lawyer, not as a judge, I give my opinion that we can have one tariff in British Columbia, and another in the Atlantic Provinces, under the Organic Act; and if the Act does not allow it, then we must alter it.

I have already given notice of motion respecting protection for our farmers and manufacturers. I desire to add a resolution to the proposed terms, keeping the power in the hands of the Local Legislature to impose a tax on certain imports, in case the tariff be too low. With respect to brewers, the tariff can easily be arranged so as to protect them; and the Hon. Member for New Westminster has answered the objection to the Dominion fishery laws. As for commerce, that common sense that the Hon. Mr. Wood calls statesmanship, will settle that; for if Confederation would injure the commercial interests of British Columbia, it would also injure the interests of the Dominion.

The Hon. Member for Victoria City has said a great deal about centralization. But I say, Sir, that there must be a centre somewhere. We cannot have it in British Columbia, and a centre would be no worse in Ottawa than in Washington. The Pacific Coast, so far as the United States are concerned, is represented at Washington, which is not so large a city as New York.

Representation is one of the most important elements in free Governments; and as it has been urged by the Hon Mr. Wood and others, that British Columbia would not be heard in the Canadian Senate or Commons, and that our small delegation would be crushed and out-voted, I will briefly examine the subject. Now, Sir, the whole of the Pacific States of the United States have only twelve Representatives in Congress—6 in the Senate and 6 in the House of Representatives. California has two Senators and three Representatives; Oregon, two Senators and one Representative; Washington Territory, one Delegate; and Nevada, two Senators and one Representative. Now, it is proposed in the Resolutions to grant to British Columbia twelve Members—four in the Senate and eight in the Commons—a number equal to the whole representation of the Pacific States, with 1,000,000 people, in the United States Congress. Again, there are only five States that have more than twelve Members in Congress. They are New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. Take another glance at the representation of the States most remote from Washington. Texas has five Members; Florida, three; Maine, seven; and California, five. Remoteness and small numbers have never caused any of these States to be treated unfairly. Under the popular system of government there, the small States do not go to the wall. Has little Delaware gone to the wall? Has Rhode Island gone to the wall? No; neither would British Columbia go to the wall in the Parliament of Canada. The Government of Canada is based on the popular will; and that is the highest of guarantee that we shall be treated fairly by the Dominion.

I have never heard of Scotland being injured because she had a smaller representation in Parliament than England.

[Hon. Mr. Wood—"Yes, yes. Two revolutions followed immediately upon union."]

Yes; but that don't affect my proposition. A little blood-letting, however, does no harm occasionally. I would not object to a little revolution now and again in British Columbia after Confederation, if we were treated unfairly; for I am one of those who believe that political hatreds attest the vitality of a State. [Hear, hear.]

The Honourable and learned Member for Victoria says that all power will be taken away by Confederation. Why, Sir, the Hon. gentleman cannot have read the Organic Act. For he will find the exclusive powers of the Dominion and the Provinces clearly set forth in it. Then, Sir, on the question of guarantee for the fulfilment of the conditions by Canada, there appears to be some misapprehension in the Hon. gentleman's mind. In point of fact we have a guar-

antee from the Imperial Government. If the Dominion refuse to keep the terms and repudiate their part of the bargain, we can appeal to the Imperial Government to release us.

[Hon. Mr. Wood—"Let us have it in black and white."]

Why, let the Act be repealed and down go the terms. The sovereign power is in the Parliament of England. It made the Act, and if it is violated without redress, it can repeal it, and the power of Canada ceases.

The Honourable and learned Member for Victoria City has referred to the possibility of a Fenian invasion, and said what will become of the Railway in such an event. I believe, Sir, on such an extraordinary occasion, such as invasion, each one in the Colony would be patriotic enough to do without a few miles of Railway, until the invasion may be put down

It has been asked what is the gain under Confederation.

At present we have no surplus revenue. But with Confederation on equitable terms, there will be a clear gain of $384,000 annually from subsidies and reduction of tariff; therefore, as $384,000 is to nothing, so is Confederation to Isolation. There are a great many points to which I could allude were I disposed to trespass longer on the time of the Council; but I reserve them until we go into Committee.

There are, however, some few things to which I will passingly allude. It is important to British Columbia to know what will be the qualification of Members to the Dominion Parliament [Hear, hear, from Dr. Helmcken] and the qualification of electors. And with reference to the Local Constitution, it may be necessary for us to know whether our Governors cannot be elected as in the United States, instead of being appointed on the English principle; and whether we may not acquire the right to pass local laws over the veto of the Governor, by a two-third vote of the Legislature. The usury laws, imprisonment for debt, and many other matters will require careful consideration and attention.

With respect to the main principle, I am in favour of Confederation, provided the financial terms are right in amount, and if the other terms will contribute to the advancement and protection of our industry. If we cannot get favourable terms, which I believe we can, it will then be for the people of this Country to say whether we shall remain in isolation or seek some other more favourable union.

The Debate was here adjourned until Friday, at 1 o'clock.

---

FRIDAY, 11TH MARCH, 1870.

---

The Debate was resumed by the Hon. Mr. RING, who on his rising was greeted with cries of "Spoke, spoke."

Hon. Mr. Ring said:—Sir, I have only spoken to the amendment, and have a right to speak to the original motion.

Doubts were expressed as to the Hon. gentleman's right to speak a second time, but the Presiding Member was not called upon to decide, and Mr. Ring proceeded:—

Sir, The Hon. Member for Victoria District commenced by congratulating the Council on having the grand question of Confederation now before them. He congratulated them on the great advantage of being able to grapple with a great question like this.

I cannot compliment him on the way in which he introduced his subject. I admire his perseverance, and confess that on many subjects he enlightens Members on both sides of the House.

I lament to find that having alluded to the opening speech of the Attorney General, he thought fit to cast unwarrantable imputations upon that gentleman and the members of the Government. He suddenly turned aside and quoted a text, which he applied to the Official Members of this Council. He likened one of them to a woman who forgets her modesty and shame, and goes after lovers for bread; to her who has a harlot's forehead, and refuses to be ashamed. Sir, I deprecate such allusions; they throw no light upon the subject. I think that an Honourable and grave body like this, on hearing such charges, should have at once risen to express their indignation rather than have condoned it by their silence. Nothing is more easy than to take any one act of a man, or of a body of men, and apply it to a sinister motive, when it is capable of an honourable one. Sir, I was very glad that the Hon. Attorney General had the courage to follow the example of the English House of Commons. He, finding no Chaplain to this House, supplied the defect by invoking the blessing of God, which was met by a sneer. I say I admire his courage in fronting a godless age, by the invocation of the blessing of Him in whom we live and move and have our being. He was not ashamed to acknowledge the controlling power of Heaven over the destinies of this fallen Colony.

Now, Sir, the Attorney General descanted at great length on the advantages of Union. He put that as the basis of the Government proposition. There is nothing like Union he says; this is a noble sentiment which all must join in. Everyone would welcome that comprehensive brotherhood which embraces all civilized Nations. I am sure that when the Hon. Member for Victoria alluded to the possibility of a prospective union with other Powers, he did not do so in the idea of this Colony abandoning its allegiance to the Crown; because he expressed a wish to see the desire of general union spreading; is no reason that he should desire to shake off his connection with the Mother Country. Had it been otherwise, I should have deplored the Hon. gentleman's loss of loyalty. Some surprise has existed at the Hon. Member for Victoria offering suggestions as to the possibility of any other union. Why so? The Hon. Attorney General himself gracefully introduced it. Why should not the English-speaking race live in peace, and form one Nation? The people of the United States spring from one common stock with ourselves. I long to see the time when all national sectarianism shall be swept away.

My position as Member for Nanaimo has been assailed in a cowardly way by what is called the Press. I have been accused of shrinking from my duty to my constituents at Nanaimo, because I echoed their sentiments against Confederation. I ask the indulgence of the House whilst I allude to what occurred at Nanaimo at the last election. At that time the question of Confederation was rife throughout the Colony; peoples' minds were agitated; the people of Nanaimo were almost unanimous against it. In what I said to them during the progress of the election, and also on the hustings, I told them that I agreed with their views against Confederation, but that when it came before the Council I should give it my best attention. It was not made a test question at my election. The people of Nanaimo are still of their original opinion; and, therefore, I express their opinion now, against this measure; and say that their convictions are against Confederation, notwithstanding the "No, noes" of certain Hon. Members. There may be some amongst them, Canadians by birth and principle, who desire Confederation, who, though they are here, can say with the poet:—

> "Where e'er I roam, whatever realms I see,
> My heart untravelled fondly turns to thee."

Thus much for Nanaimo.

Now, I say, Sir, that the question of Confederation ought to be fully and amply discussed in this House, and to do this there should be a full House. I deny that it is the desire of the people to have Confederation, but I say let the people have an opportunity of expressing their opinions in this House. Let the disfranchised districts have first restored to them the rights of which they have been defrauded. The Governor has been betrayed into supposing that the people want Confederation, and assuming this to be true, he says I shall now give the people an opportunity to discuss the terms.

But let the Franchise be restored, then let the general question of Confederation come before an enlarged representation; and I say that Confederation should be put alone, aye or no. Shall we have Confederation? and not upon what terms shall we have it. The proper course is to dissolve the House, issue new writs, and let the people say whether they want Confederation; and after they have said yes, then descend into the particulars of it. A Government measure is now proposed, we are bound hand and foot, and handed over to Ottawa. I say, Sir, that being so handed over, we ought to let our masters settle the terms for us.

I, therefore, venture again, Mr. President, to repeat that if it is to go abroad that the people desire Confederation, then the House should be dissolved, and a fair vote taken.

The Hon. Member for Victoria District puts it as if the voice of the people had been heard. I ask how?

Through newspapers? Conventions? Speeches? I say this is not the proper way. Let the people speak in this House, through a full body of Representatives of their own choosing.

The question has been amply ventilated in this Council. The Hon. Member for Victoria City has gone fully into what he considers the difficulties. He has been met on the other side in a manly and able reply by the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, who has been again met by the Hon. Mr. Wood.

It is not for me to go into the question of terms now; but I deny emphatically that Confederation is desired by the people. My own constituents are against it; many other constituencies are, as I believe, against it also.

I ask, then, why should the Government attempt to force these Resolutions upon us, by means of the Official Members, who are only supreme in numbers?

The people have had no opportunity to express their wish. Difficulties have been presented by an Hon. Member, arising from the space between British Columbia and Canada—difficulties arising from the means of transit, and from the means of communication being cut off—difficulties arising from what is at present called the rebellion in the North-West Provinces, that strife, as I am informed, gathering strength day by day. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos.] Hon. Members say "No, no." I am so informed. I hope it is not so, but if it be, then under the name of union we are called upon to take a part in this internecine war.

I long for union as much as any man. In union of good there is strength and victory, but in union of evil there is defeat and disaster. I shall not occupy the time of this Council in adverting to matters which have been amply discussed; in expressing my conscientious opinion I do my duty. The Hon. Mr. Wood has told us that he counts professional honours as nought. I say nothing of prior claims to professional honours which I have lost, from, at all times, conscientiously supporting what I conceived to be right. His Excellency says that we are not fit for Responsible Government. I want to know on what local data he says so? Who has tried the people? On the scope of whose mind is it said they are not fit? Who has examined them?

The Hon. Member for Victoria District has properly said, if Hon. Members were paid for their attendance in the House, you would soon see whether men were capable or not to enter upon and fulfil the duties of Responsible Government. Then we should see whether the gentlemen disguised in mean apparel—Graduates of Oxford, Cambridge, and other Universities—who have cast their lot in this Colony, but are unable to defray their travelling expenses from remote places to the Capital. We should see, I say, whether they were capable, or not, of enlightening and controlling by their wisdom the feeble powers of Governmental diplomacy. Sir, by enlarged representation we shall discover such men. We had one foot forward in the direction of freedom, it has been forced back. The franchise has been taken away. Sir, I have very feebly endeavoured to touch upon these subjects. In fine, I affirm that the matter has not been discussed fairly. There must be an enlarged representation, that the people may tell the Government what they want.

Hon. Members who have supported Confederation, have failed in showing that this is the time for it. They are afraid to ask the people. They have refused to do so.

Much has been said; more will be said. I have listened, and have heard high sounding words, and inflated tautology of this and that Hon. Member, which remind me of soap-bubbles, which, though beautiful by the reflection of the sun's prismatic colours, are equally remarkable for their rotundity and their emptiness.

The Hon. Mr. BARNARD said:—Sir, in rising to support the motion of the Hon. and learned Attorney General, I can but express my feelings of pleasure in being permitted to take a part in the great work in hand—that of hewing off the rough corners of the block which has come to us from the hands of the Executive, and which, after receiving the finishing touch at the hands of the people, will become the keystone of the great Confederation arch which will, ere twelve months, extend from ocean to ocean. The terms as sent down by His Excellency are, I consider, a fair subject of congratulation. The manner in which they have been received by this House and the people is another subject of congratulation; and the paucity and utter idleness of the arguments used by the opposition, represented in this House as it is by the talent of the opposing party in the country, are also subjects of congratulation to His Excellency, this House, and the country. It is wrong, Mr. President, to charge the desire for Confederation on the part of its promoters to a desire for change. So far as my constituency and the adjoining ones on the Mainland are concerned, I may say safely that such was not the case—we accepted the Organic Act constituting this Council, and agreed to work it out to its legitimate end; and we have not countenanced nor have we been subjected to the many changes which other parts of this Colony have. I desire, before going further, to allude to a charge commonly made against my countrymen—often offensively put—but yesterday put by the Hon. Mr. Wood, in his usual gentlemanly way. It is that of "Canadian proclivity." As a native-born Canadian, in common with others, I love the land of my birth. We admire her institutions and revere her laws; but we never forget the land of our adoption, and we would no more consent to see her wronged by Canada than would the tens of thousands of Englishmen who have made Canada their home, permit a wrong to be done her by England.

It is also wrong and contrary to fact that, "so anxious are we for Confederation that we would accede to any terms proposed." During the past three years, I have been one of the foremost in advocating the cause of Confederation; and, in so doing, throughout the interior of the Colony, I am free to confess I never uttered such a sentiment; and, in justice to my fellow-countrymen in particular, and the advocates of this cause in general, I will say that I never heard any one express a desire that this Colony should be confederated, except on such terms as might on investigation be found to be just and beneficial.

We desire Confederation with Canada, because we believe that it will be to the interest of this Colony to unite with the progressive Colonies to the east. That they are progressive I assert, and as proof I point to the fact that, previous to Confederation, Canada proper had expended $184,000,000 on public works, principally in building canals. Up to 1869, $170,000,000 had been expended in railways. She pays to-day $300,000 yearly for her ocean steam mail service alone, and her enterprise is followed by her people. Her manufactures are increasing yearly, and even now she is exporting cloths to England, and competing there with cheap labour. One firm alone, composed of men who landed in Canada penniless, now has $9,000,000 invested in ocean steamers, employing 4,500 men, and thus sustaining 22,000 persons. Among the objections urged by Hon. Members against Confederation is our proximity to the United States. This, I hold, is no objection. Canadians are not taught to fear competition with the United States. The general feeling there is that we can hold our own (except in point of numbers) with her in any direction whatever. It is to her we look for a great portion of our trade, and the advantages of such trade are mutual.

The question is often asked: "What are the immediate advantages to be derived by us from Confederation?" My reply is that, in addition to the amount paid us by way of subsidies, we will save by a reduction in the tariff and by importing Canadian manufactures, a very considerable sum, thus reducing our taxation. Next, the terms propose that $1,000,000 be spent on a waggon-road to be commenced immediately and completed in three years, thus causing over $300,000 a year to be spent.

Hon. gentlemen will recollect that in 1861, 1862, and 1863, immigration poured in on us, caused by the report of rich discoveries in Cariboo, and by a knowledge on the part of those coming that the Government was spending large sums on public works, and that those who failed in the mines might fall back on the roads to replenish their purses; and many who are now permanent settlers in the interior acknowledge that they made their "farm stake" there. How much more is this likely to be the case if the larger works contemplated in the terms are carried out.

Then, Sir, look at the construction of a Railway. You may judge of the magnitude of the work by the following figures. There were employed on the Central Pacific at one time 25,000 men and 6,000 teams; 600 tons of material were forwarded daily to the point of construction; 30 vessels in harbour at one time, loaded with material; the wharves at

San Francisco and Sacramento loaded with railway iron; 70 locomotives landed, and 100 cars built to carry on the work on construction account; no less than 30 sawmills in operation at one point at one time. The enterprise that set this enormous trade in motion is not one of greater magnitude than will be the work undertaken on this side, and if our farmers and population generally do not profit, and that immediately, by the carrying on of such enterprises as these, let them succumb, for I know of no state of prosperity that can help them. I contend the benefits of Confederation, in these respects at least, will be immediate. But Hon. Members have said "the United States will derive the benefit." If that argument holds good, why not tell the merchants of Wharf Street to close their doors because foreign manufacturers reap a part of the benefit of their trade. Better, a great deal, for the opponents of this cause to advise the farmers to cultivate every inch of their farms and garner up their crops, for the day assuredly will come when they will have ample market for all they can raise.

It has been urged here, that Canada cannot retain her population, much less the immigration that comes to her shores. In this, Sir, there is considerable truth, although the Hon. and learned Member for Victoria has not put the matter fairly before this House. In giving the number of passengers going from Canada to the United States, he has omitted to give you the number of those passing from the States into Canada. One reason why Canada has not retained the whole number of emigrants landed on her shores, is that they find greater attractions in the treeless prairies of the Western States, than in the heavily timbered lands of Canada. This, Sir, has ever been a serious drawback to her. But now the case is different. Having acquired the vast territories of the great North-West, she will open them to settlement, and then she will have inducements to offer such as cannot be boasted of by any other country in the world. Open those millions of acres to the settler, and you will see such a rush of immigration—not only from the older countries of Europe—but from the United States, as will astonish the world, and stand unparalled in the history of immigration. Canada's hardy sons who have left their homes for the Western States—allured by the advantages of prairie over wooded lands—will join in swelling the numbers, and once more plant their feet on British soil.

The difficulties of defence have been spoken of as a formidable obstacle. Sir, she never regarded them in any such light. Canada has no fears in that direction. She relies on the thorough good understanding that has existed between herself and the United States for so long a period, as a guarantee for the future. Their interests are so identical that they cannot afford to quarrel. The troubles between them heretofore, have been on England's account, and not Canada's, as witness the Trent affair, and the more recent Fenian invasion, which was rather a stab at England than an attack on Canada. During the recent fratricidal war in the United States, Canada had a difficult part to play in maintaining strict neutrality, yet she came out unscathed. It must be remembered, also, that Canada possesses in her canal system, a powerful lever—a guarantee for peace—vastly more potent than fortifications. The great bulk of the produce of the Western States finds its way to the ocean through Canadian channels, which could be closed at any moment.

As to that "other issue," (I will not use the word that has been so freely used outside) I have no fears for Canada or this Colony either. It used to be fashionable here, in early days, to associate the name of Canada with rebellion. It was the result of prejudice and ignorance, and was a great mistake.

I recently read, Sir, an account of a meeting held in one of our principal Canadian cities, on the occasion of a Sabbath school convention. An American gentleman was engaged in addressing the house, filled to its utmost capacity. In the course of his remarks, having occasion to refer to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, he added:—"American though I am, I can with all my heart say, 'God bless the Queen.'" Immediately, Sir, without any preconcerted action, the entire audience of men, women, and children rose to their feet and sung the National Anthem. That gentleman said, that such a spontaneous, hearty, and unanimous outburst of loyalty was probably never heard before.

Such, Sir, is the kind of loyalty we were taught in Canada, such is the kind that is being taught to the rising generation of the new Dominion to-day; and I leave it to you as to whether there is room for that "other issue" or not.

Before concluding, Sir, I would wish to remark with reference to the charge made by the Hon. Member for Victoria District against the Hon. Attorney General, that his conversion to Confederation was late. I know that it is impossible to make some Honourable Members believe anything good of Officials, whether in respect of Confederation or anything else. But I simply desire to relate this fact.

I had occasion to go into the Hon. Attorney General's office in 1867, and he then showed me a letter, written by himself, in favour of Confederation; and after perusing that letter I felt convinced that when, in his estimation, the proper time arrived, the cause would have a warm and sincere advocate in the Attorney General. I mention this in order to show that the Hon. Member for Victoria District has no right to arrogate to himself that he was the only man who was far-seeing enough to recognize the advantages of Confederation three years ago, and as a reproof to him for finding fault with the position taken by Hon. Official Members on this question now.

To sum up, Sir, I say that amongst the Statesmen of Canada, we may safely look for men fully competent to control the affairs of a young nation. They are men of as much ambition and grasp of thought as are the rulers in the adjoining States; and, depend upon it, nothing will be left undone to advance the prosperity and well-being of every portion of their vast Dominion. We may safely repose full confidence in them. England has done so, or she would never have committed the well-being of four millions of her subjects to their care.

They can steer the good ship "Dominion," and hold her on her way. She will receive many a shock, "but 'twill be of the waves, and not the rock."

The Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS, Member for Lillooet, said:—Mr. President, It is not my attention to occupy the attention of the House at any great length. I shall pass in review rapidly the arguments for and against Confederation, as they have been used by Hon. Members who have spoken during the progress of this debate.

It seems to me, Sir, that the people and their interests have been entirely ignored throughout the discussion of this question, and perhaps intentionally. I refer to the subject of Responsible Government ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos], which has up to this stage been all but lost sight of. I, Sir, am one of those men who believe in the people.

I remember that in opening this debate, the Hon. Attorney General invoked the Divine blessing upon the work upon which we were then entering. This was high-sounding, and a very nice picture to look at, but it does not wear well without that strict attention to the divine rights of the people, which is inalienable from true political economy.

I have a distinct recollection of most Hon. Members now occupying an official position at this Council Board, and of the positions which they occupied when first they came to this Colony. I have often asked myself what entitles these Hon. Members to govern this Colony; but I have never been able to answer myself satisfactorily. I am perfectly ready to admit the ability of Executive Members as individuals. The learned eloquence of the Hon. Attorney General has always, since I have had the honour to sit at this Council Board, impressed me with a deep sense of the advantage of thorough forensic training; and the power and force of the reply of the Hon. the Chief Commissioner has ever and again made me feel with especial force the utter hopelessness of combating stern official reticence, with even the most brilliant powers of oratory. Yet, Sir, whatever our admiration for individual excellence, however great our estimation of personal worth, the question has still remained unanswered, and, in my opinion, unanswerable. What is there in the collective wisdom of these Honourable Official Members that entitles them to arrogate to themselves the right to rule? Are they, I ask, the dominant race, and are the people serfs?

We have heard a great deal about absorption, and the danger of the larger body swallowing up the smaller. I think about as much of that danger as I do of the other evil threatened in such earnest and thrilling language by the Hon. Member for Victoria, namely, that our salmon would under Confederation, and the protection from salmon nets that would be extended to them, increase and multiply to such an extent that they would absorb all the smaller fish.

I, however, to speak seriously, doubt very much if the Hon. Member can cite a single example in History of the larger absorbing the lesser, unless the larger possessed better qualifications as in the case of the absorption by British Columbia of Vancouver Island. Sir, we must give up all personal prejudices, and we must bend our minds to the establishment of a great British Empire upon this Pacific Coast.

Lord Macauley says that "Governments are made for the people, and not the people for the Governments." Yet, Sir, how different seems to be the course of reasoning in this Colony. Here we have a strange compound of sickly representation and unpopular officialdom. The want of Responsible Government has become intolerable; the people have ceased to respect the Government, and the Government seem to be doing their best to educate the people up to hating the officials. There is to my mind, Sir, no necessity for the continuance of such a state of things. only let the peoples' voice be heard, and there will be a change. The overwhelming preponderance of the official element in this Council, and the presence in the Legislative body of officials who are paid by the people, and yet are not responsible to them, is the real cause of the alienation of the hearts of the people from the Government. The votes of these Hon. gentlemen must always oscillate between their own interests and what their own consciences dictate to them as for the good of the country. It is our duty, Sir, to bring back the hearts of the people. We must have a Government by and for the people. This is what I believe the people really require, and this and more, if necessary, the Government must be prepared to give them. The people of this Colony will consent to no arrangement which has not for its foundation—Responsible Government. We must be prepared to pull down and demolish the old structure, in order to rear up one that shall endure—as a Government secure in the affections of the people only can endure. I warn Hon. gentlemen that they must endeavour to recover the wills of the people; then, and not till then, will return that prosperity which we all desire to see.

I hope, Sir, that the Executive will not attempt to make any arrangement with the Dominion Government which does not include popular self-government. The people will never accept Confederation without Responsible Government.

We must first get the tree—Responsible Government—and we may afterwards, with some reason, hope to get the fruit. I say, Sir, that it is a gross libel upon the intelligence of the people of this Colony, to say that we are not fitted for self-government. In no country can you find men better capable of governing themselves, and of managing their own affairs, than in this Colony. I hold, Sir, that the greatest enemies of the people are those who always endeavour to blazon forth their learning. I am proud to say that I am of the people. My education, if not of so high a culture as that of some Hon. Members of this House, has at least enabled me, up to this time, to make my own way in the world, unaided by official pay and without the assistance of official favour or influence. And when I hear Hon. Members speaking of the people as a class unfit for self-government, I find it difficult to believe that such a set of men are the same as have been speaking before, in this House, and outside on Confederation.

In conclusion, Sir, I say fearlessly that Responsible Government is a *sine qua non* in the terms of Confederation. Place what conditions you will before the people, without the condition of Responsible Government, and Confederation is killed.

Confederation means to Official Members a pension, to the people it means self-government, and I say, Sir, that above all things, we must keep in view the absolute necessity of keeping control of our own local affairs, otherwise Confederation would be useless to the country, and I warn Hon. Members at the other side of the House, that to exclude Responsible Government from the terms, is to ensure defeat for the whole Confederation scheme when it comes before the people at the polls.

The Hon. Mr. CARRALL, Member for Cariboo, said:—Mr. President, I did not intend to open my lips during this debate; indeed I am left with very little to say by the Honourable gentlemen who have preceded me. I have taken notes with a view, if those assertions which were put forth were not answered, of replying to them.

For three days I have sat at this Board and heard discussions *pro* and *con*. I have heard nearly every word; certainly every argument which Honourable Members on both sides have adduced; especially have I listened to every argument of those who are in opposition, and I believe that nothing remains unanswered—in fact but a few crumbs are left for me. Another reason why I did not desire to make a speech is that my principles are pretty thoroughly known, and I deem it almost a work of supererogation to reiterate my sentiments.

But as this debate as to whether we should go into Committee or not has taken such a serious turn, I think it right and proper to say a few words. Whoever knows me through this Colony, or through British North America, knows that my principles have never changed on this great Confederation question. I have always maintained that the fragments of empire lying loose, so to speak, in British North America, east and west of the Rocky Mountains, should be united and consolidated under one Government. The question of the confederation of the whole Colonial Empire of Great Britain is one that has always appeared to me to be replete with the greatest interest, and I trust that I may be spared to see this consolidation consummated.

With regard to the advantages that Confederation will bring to British Columbia, it is almost forbidden ground, for the advantages are in reality part of the Resolutions. If I allude to them I am forestalling the debate on terms, and as I should not be in a position to prove anything which is in futurity, I had perhaps better abstain from touching upon the subject. However, this much I will say, that, after sentiment and loyalty are disposed of, it becomes a question of advantage.

The terms sent down to this House, in my opinion, warrant our acceptance of them in their entirety; but if the House think otherwise, I may, I am sure, go so far as to say that the Executive are open to receive suggestions, and that there will be no objection to adopt any suggestions which will not be likely to jeopardize the success of the whole scheme. In this conviction, I do not propose to go over the ground that has already been taken. But I must allude to what I cannot help calling feeling of over-care and caution which has been displayed throughout this debate.

I believe, Mr. President, that you are an Englishman, and as a nation I think you express too much caution, fear, and anxiety with respect to the course which Canada might pursue. I do not speak personally, but such appears to me to be the characteristic quality of Englishmen, and it has especially cropped out during this debate. I say that I believe we are treating with a far-seeing, fair-dealing set of men who would never forfeit their word, Statesmen who would be incapable of offering "mean conditions," even if we of British Columbia would accept them. They will give us terms to make us happy and contented. Another reason for our feeling confidence in the future is that we shall have under these terms, as the Hon. Member for Victoria District says, an enormous proportion of Representatives at Ottawa, and I presume that each of these Representatives will have a voice and the gift of speech.

It is fair to augur that the Dominion Statesmen will give us what will make us contented and prosperous. In touching upon this point, I should like to make an historical allusion, and for example I would refer to the present condition of the Union between Great Britain and Ireland. ["Hear, hear," from Dr. Helmcken.] When Hon. gentlemen say "Hear, hear," they may think I have given an unapt illustration. We, however, know that the number of Ireland's representatives, amounting to something over one hundred, have enabled the Irish members of the British House of Commons to hold the balance of power and the bulk of patronage between the great contending political parties, and by swaying between the Gladstones and Disraelis, or other leaders of the day, they have frequently been able to turn the scale so as to obtain what they desired, and to secure a liberal share of the patronage to office. I maintain, Sir, in this connection, that if British Columbia found that by reason of her small representation, large in comparison with the representation of the different States in the Congress of America, I say, that if British Columbian Members found that there was any disposition to tyrannise in the Dominion House of Commons, which I do not for one moment fear, they could make common cause with other small maritime Provinces against Canada proper. To quote the words of the Hon. Chief Commissioner, I believe that British Columbia will be a pet Province of the Confederacy. I try, Sir, to avoid speech-making, the time for that will be in Committee.

I do not hope to sway a single vote by any remarks that I make. I believe that every Hon. Member came here, previously prepared, to vote one way or the other, and I do not think any eloquent orators, and much less any feeble words of mine, will cause one of them to change his opinion. But I make a speech in order that a record may be taken of it, and my constituents may be able to see that I was not dumb. I believe, I say, that all Hon. Members came down with their opinions formed, as to whether the amendment of the Hon. and learned Member for Victoria, or the proposition of the Hon. and learned Attorney General, which was so ably put before us, should be carried. I sincerely hope, however, that Hon. Members will join me in voting down the amendment, and in supporting the motion of the Hon. Attorney General. This is, emphatically, the question of the day, and the policy of the Government should meet with a liberal and warm support from every Member of this Council, in order that the question may be fairly brought before the people for final decision.

And here, Sir, with the permission of the House, I will say one word upon the course pursued by the Government. The Executive Council have been actuated by motives of duty only, they have brought down these Resolutions, based on a broad view of the whole subject, and they ask you to make suggestions and additions. [Dr. Helmcken—"No they don't."] Yes, Sir, I maintain that the Executive do so, and I will maintain it with my last breath. The Executive are prepared to consider, and if possible give effect to, every amendment or suggestion of this Council, provided it does not jeopardize the success of the scheme with the Canadian Government. The final verdict must come from the people, and I can safely maintain that nothing could be fairer.

Among things brought up in the course of this debate, the questions of Tariff and Responsible Government occupy prominent positions. I think the Hon. Member for Victoria District has taken right ground, when he said that it was competent for the Dominion Government to alter and amend the tariff so as to protect every vested interest in this Colony. I am no lawyer, but I believe the Canadian Statesmen are sufficiently far-seeing to take care that not an interest in this Colony shall suffer by the Resolutions which we are about passing. With regard to the Dominion Tariff, people thought that the abrogation of the Reciprocity Treaty was the death-knell of the independence of Canada. I have lived, however, to see her more prosperous by that abrogation. It has taught her to develop her own resources, and to become self-reliant. After she was prevented from going to the United States, by that abrogation, she turned her attention to her own resources, and I believe she is now going to be one of the most progressive nations upon the earth. Undoubtedly, she is determined to progress westward, until she reaches British Columbia and the Pacific; and with all her progressive tendency she will not abate one jot of the loyalty for which, now as ever, she is distinguished.

Now, with regard to Responsible Government. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos.] I desire to touch lightly upon this subject in passing, because I have been told that my popularity has suffered some remarks to which I gave utterance in this House upon a previous occasion. Much as I value popularity, I must on this question express my honest and conscientious opinion as an individual. I believe that I was the first to break ground on the question of Responsible Government, in connection with Confederation. I did it, not hastily or thoughtlessly, but on conviction; and I maintain that so long as I do it honestly, I am free to say what I please, as an individual, upon this matter. I do not believe, Sir, that, with our present population, with our people scattered over a vast extent of thinly populated country, and having regard to to the various conflicting interests consequent on remoteness from the centre, the principle of Responsible Government cannot be satisfactorily applied to this community at present. I believe entirely in the ability and fitness of the Anglo-Saxon race to govern themselves, but I say that the time has not yet arrived under which that particular form of government, generally known as Responsible, can be satisfactorily worked in this Colony. I believe that the scheme foreshadowed by the Governor for Representative Government will be the best that, under present circumstances, the Colony can have. The popular members under that system will have a clear majority, and, consequently, the people will have the control of the purse-strings. I do not speak these words as a member of the Executive Council, but as the expression of my own deliberate opinion. Sir, I was not sent here pledged to any particular platform. My constituents had confidence in me, and were content that I should act on my own judgment. Speaking officially, I say that Responsible Government is not a question of Union. The Act of Union gives us the exclusive right to alter our own laws with respect to everything connected with the internal and local Government of the Province, so long as the Federal prerogative, if I may so call it, is not infringed. If the majority of the people want Responsible Government after Confederation, neither Governor Musgrave nor any other power on earth can prevent their having it. It is unfounded, unfair, and unjust, on the part of those who are opposed to the Government on the question of Confederation, to endeavour to put any other complexion upon the matter.

With respect, Mr. President, to the remarks about Cabinet Ministers and Executive Councillors, which have fallen from certain Hon. Members, I will only refer to the work that the Executive have laid before this House. From the general approbation which has been tendered, both in this House and on the outside, to the terms of Confederation which have been sent down by the Executive, I think that I am fairly entitled to assume that our labour has not been in vain, and that it has given satisfaction. I thank this Council for the words of encouragement and approbation with which they have accepted these conditions, especially those who have endorsed them. No one, not even the Hon. Member for Victoria City, can say that it is not the wish of the people that this question should be discussed, and ultimately dealt with by the people.

A charge has been preferred by the Hon. Member for Victoria District, against the Hon. Attorney General and the Hon. Chief Commissioner, to the effect that they had turned their coats and changed since they had given votes upon Confederation in this House upon a former occasion. If they have changed, I maintain that upon conviction they are not to be blamed for doing so. It was well known that the Hon. gentleman had stated, or at all events I have always so understood it, had a telegram, or some other information from head quarters, more than a year ago, to the effect that the Dominion Government were not prepared to negotiate terms of Confederation with this Colony, until after the settlement of the Red River question, which was then pending with the Hudson Bay Company. The Hon. Attorney General, and the Hon. Chief Commissioner took this same ground last year. They were of opinion that nothing could be done to further Confederation satisfactorily, until the sovereignty of the Dominion was established in the North-West Territory. Both assured me privately that they were in favour of Confederation, and I say that they entered into the consideration of the scheme without mention of pensions being secured to them. Who, I ask, are Confederates? The people most unquestionably; and could we, the people of this Colony, ever have made Confederation a successful issue, unless it had been taken up by Government. His Excellency Governor Musgrave has done nothing but what Prime Ministers do every day, in making this a Government question. On the part of the Government, I cordially invite the assistance, co-operation, and earnest deliberation of all Members of the Council to the scheme—a good one—and after we have done our best with it, we must leave it to the people.

Before I close my remarks, Sir, I must allude to what fell from the Hon. Member for Victoria City, whose opinion and lightest remarks are always received and listened to by this House with the greatest deference and respect, and every wrinkle of whose brow is a notch in the calendar of a well-spent life, for whose character as an individual I have the highest reverence and esteem. I cannot but say, however, that in my opinion, and I believe in the opinion of this House, what the Hon. gentleman did say about another possible issue, was ill-timed, nopportune, and unhappy; and, Sir, I deem it my duty as a Member of the Executive Council to say, that if he did intend to foreshadow the idea that the other union, to which he made ill-timed allusion, could ever be an issue in this Colony, he entirely misrepresented the views of the Executive Council. In this connection I desire to say that, in common with the Chief Commissioner, I feel a great respect for our neighbours of the Great Republic; I honour the country and its institutions; particularly I esteem the people of America in the exercise of national and domestic relations; they are true Anglo-Saxons; they are at this moment lavishing an amount of hospitality on Prince Arthur, which would do honour to

any nation. But, whilst professing great respect for the people and for the Government of the United States, I confess that I do not like their political institutions. I have many friends in America, and I have spent some time there myself, in their military service, but I left America a greater Canadian than ever. And I say, Sir, that I deem the action taken by certain foreigners here, in getting up a petition, which has perhaps been brought into more prominent notice than it was entitled to, exceedingly unhappy, and I know that I speak the sentiments of my constituents when I say so. These foreigners have received every hospitality, and have been treated with respect and liberality in this Colony; they enjoyed all the rights and privileges to which they would have been entitled in their own country, and perhaps more; they have acted foolishly towards the flag that sheltered them, and have abused the hospitality which has been extended to them in getting up this petition. If any British subjects signed it, I consider them unworthy of the name; they would be better in the chain-gang.

I must refer once again to the Hon. Member for Victoria City. He said that patriotism was dead in this Colony; that interest and self-interest was paramount, and that the dollar was supreme, and was the only patriotism. [Dr. Helmcken—"What? what? I said nothing of the kind."] I maintain that the words were used, and I say that the Hon. Member misunderstood or misrepresented the feelings of the people of this Colony in saying so. It is, perhaps, unbecoming in me, who have not the stake in the Country and who have not the status, domestic, monetary, or political, of most other gentlemen round this Council Board, and who have, comparatively speaking, but lately come to the Colony, to express an opinion; but nevertheless I do say that patriotism is not dead in this Colony, and that the people are as patriotic, noble, and generous-hearted as any other people in the world.

Hon. Mr. Helmcken—Sir, I rise to a question of privilege. I cannot allow the Hon. Member to make a speech about something I did not say without correcting him. I said that this Colony had no love for Canada; the bargain for love could not be; it can only be the advancement of material interests which will lead to union.

Hon. Mr. Carrall—I maintain, Sir, that I have not in any way exaggerated what the Hon. gentleman did say; and I conclude by saying that the people of British Columbia are loyal, honourable, and true, and when they give their adhesion to the Dominion they will uphold the British flag, as they always have been upheld—

"The flag that has braved a thousand years
The battle and the breeze."

The Hon. Mr. ALSTON, Registrar General, said:—Sir, I should not have risen to attempt to make a speech at this late hour, had it not been from the peculiar position which I occupy in this Council, and I feel that I ought to apologise for detaining the House, even for a few minutes, after the very exhaustive arguments on both sides have been heard with such patient attention.

As I am neither one of the Executive, nor a Representative Member of this House, I have to satisfy my own conscience, and as it is probable I may not have another opportunity of expressing my opinion on the principle of Confederation with Canada, I must beg leave to say a few words.

It will be unnecessary to follow up the subject at any length, as I believe that the principle of Confederation has been virtually conceded. I give the Hon. Member for Victoria District all the credit that may be due for the consistent way in which he has agitated this question for years past, and probably the reason why the matter was not earlier brought to a successful issue through that agitation, was that either he did the right thing in the wrong way, or that he lived before his time. From 1867 to the present time, the question has been discussed in successive sessions of the Council, and it has been declared in effect that, at some future time, Confederation would be of advantage to this Colony. The Imperial Government have now spoken out unmistakeably in the matter, and have decided that Confederation shall take place. It seems that those who have the power to shape the destinies of this Colony have decided that it is to take a part in the great scheme of Confederation of the British North American Colonies, and have not hesitated to throw the whole weight of their enormous influence in the scale to effect this object; the Canadian Parliament manifestly urge this matter as a necessary part of their scheme; and last, though not least, a large portion of the people of this Colony cry aloud for it, as a panacea for all their ills. Downing Street has not hesitated to guide and control the opinions of Her Majesty's Servants in this Colony. Whether this be wise or prudent on the part of the Secretary of State for the Colonies, in view of the present constitution of this Colony, it is not for me to say, but it is of no use blinding our eyes to the fact that they who have the power will—and for aught I know should—exercise it.

It was fitting, then, that the Executive of this Colony should take the initiative and undertake the responsibility of placing the matter before the country in a tangible shape. I rejoice that they have done so, and that the working out of the basis of arrangements has fallen into so able hands, for what other party have the power to do so? If they had not preoccupied the ground, who is there? What party is there in this small community commanding sufficient general respect, that could have undertaken this important duty, with any chance of success?

Now, Sir, the Resolutions before us form no final measure, no unavoidable and perfected conditions. I look upon them simply as the basis of arrangement—the initial step in the negotiation of the business. If it had been otherwise—if these were proposed as final conditions upon which the people of the Colony would be allowed to pass no vote, over which they would exercise no control. If the Government had said to this Council, you shall have these terms or none, I would have voted against them, or retired from this Assembly. But the Governor has declared that they shall be submitted to a popular vote, and ratified by a really representative and reconstructed Council.

That being so, I can give them my conscientious support, not only because I deem it to be my duty to support every well-considered Government measure, but because I believe them to be, as far as they go, reasonable, fair, and advantageous. Before now, a Government measure has claimed a support, but a reluctant one; in this case it is not so. I trust I may be allowed to render my small tribute of thanks to the Hon. Member for Victoria City, who with great self-denial has undertaken an unenviable position, one which, of necessity, would lay himself open to attack and misrepresentation; but one in which he has done and can do great service to his country. I think I can see, in the Resolutions before me, evidences of this service; traces of his handiwork; and although he cannot give the measure his support, I feel sure, though I desire not to penetrate the secrets of that mysterious chamber, that he has done all in his power to render them as beneficial, or rather, as the Hon. Member himself would say, as little hurtful as he could to the best interests of the Colony.

When this subject came up for discussion, in the last Session of this Council, I joined those who were supposed to form the Confederate party, and moved the following Resolution:—

"That, however, desirable Confederation with Canada may hereafter become, this Council believes that until the great Territory intervening between this Colony and the Dominion is transferred to the Crown, and contains a larger and more settled population, it would be premature to express any definite opinion on the subject."

It is unnecessary for me to say anything in favour of the principle of Confederation. It is admitted in the Resolution which I have just read. I take it, Sir, that the obstacle there referred to will be speedily removed; that the small band of disaffected spirits will soon disperse, and that the machinery of Government will shortly be put in motion; and though I do not take pleasure, like the Hon. Member on my left, in revolution, political hatred, agitation, and blood and thunder generally, I am not disposed to regret the occurrence of the difficulty in the Red River, for it will teach the Canadian Government, and the Imperial Government, and all Governments, that though you may buy and sell territories, you cannot transfer the human beings therein, like so many serfs and chattels, to a fresh allegiance with impunity; that the consent of the people must be first obtained; and that though the soil may be sold, the soul is free. This measure was, to a certain extent, forced upon the Government by the people of this Colony. It is said that the people clamour for a change in the Government. Why, Sir, we have had changes enough during the time I have been in the Colony, to ruin any country; changes generally for the worse. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos.] But whether Confederation comes or not, there is one change more which I hope to see before this year expires, and that is a change in the Constitution of this Council. I desire to see all the Members, save the Executive Officers,

elected by the people; and this change is promised by the Governor.

I hope, also, that the Colony will so prosper, and the population so increase, that before many years another change will come, that is to say Responsible Government. At present, I believe we are not fitted for it; it is practically impossible, and the Governor has had the courage to declare it. I would gladly believe that the cry for this panacea for all evil does not come from those who would fain jump into vacant places, and enjoy what they are pleased to term bloated idleness. Such pharasaic patriotism was so well exposed by my much abused friend at the bottom of the table (Dr. Helmcken), that I will not further allude to it. But I say, Sir, that if they can find public servants who will perform their duties better and more perfectly, let them in God's name come on. I am content, for one, to give place to better men. Now is the opportunity offered. But, Sir, I am rejoiced that this measure has come down from the Executive; it will, when accomplished, give us rest I hope from this everlasting change. The farmer, the artizan, the capitalist, and the merchant will know what to expect, and will make their plans accordingly. Years ago, the farmer naturally expected that the Free Port system was settled and approved of. Agitation commenced, the farmer and the merchant could not carry on their pursuits without anxiety, and the Colony suffered. The Free Port was abolished —that grand political mistake,—Union with British Columbia was effected, and a heavy tariff imposed, and business calculations were confounded again But this Colony and the people have such elastic force, that they are again beginning to settle themselves down to the new order of things. Business went on, it is true, but, nevertheless, it suffered; and for the last two years agitation has again been at work. The farmer is alarmed; he is prosperous at present, but he dreads (unnecessarily I think) what will be virtually to him the Free Port system again; and so alarm, and change, and unquieiness are for ever distracting this small and struggling Colony, which, unless it had immense vital energy, and enormous latent strength, would long ago have succumbed. I see, however, in the prospect before us, a sign of better things—a more hopeful future—a state which when consummated will, I believe, secure a more settled life to the Colony.

I do not fear for the agricultural interest, for I believe the only protection which the farmer requires, is the protection of good roads, good laws, and an easy communication with the markets where he may best dispose of his produce. Self-interest, if no other reason, will induce the Canadian Government so to modify the Tariff as to endanger as little as possible the various interests, agricultural and otherwise, of the Colony. I firmly believe that Canada will deal justly with us; at any rate, it is our duty to deal frankly and in a friendly spirit with the Canadians, until we see signs of a contrary spirit animating them. I am ready to shake hands across the Rocky Mountains with our Canadian brethren; let us not open negotiations with clenched fists.

As regards the paucity of representation allowed to us in the Dominion Parliament, after what has been shown so clearly to us by the Hon. Member for Victoria District of the analagous right of representation enjoyed by the Pacific States of the American Union, I think we cannot rightly expect more.

My Hon. friend on my right (Mr. Wood), who certainly has placed the objections and arguments against Confederation forcibly before the House, says that Confederation means an union of equal States self-governed, and is equivalent to absorption. I doubt whether this is historically correct. But, Sir, whether that be so or not is beside the question, for the Resolutions which are before us are in fact Resolutions for the *Union* of this Colony with Canada. *Union* is the term used in the Organic Act, and the term Confederation never once occurs. It is *Union* we are seeking, not Confederation. The American States are States of the *Union*, not of the *Confederation*, and it has been conclusively shown that in that Country the separate States are not absorbed, although united.

And again, Sir, we were told that we are selling our independence, and transferring our loyalty. Not a bit of it. If the people of this Colony pass the measure, surely their verdict is not one of slavery, unless they be slaves themselves, and yet they are free to act. This measure will not pass unless the people of this Colony are willing that it should, and declare unmistakeably that it is for their benefit. Whatever I may individually think, I shall bow to the free popular decision, and be prepared to believe that the *vox populi* is the *vox dei*. In so great a measure, I trust the people may be guided to a right conclusion.

As to loyalty, I need add no more than has already been said so forcibly by the Hon. Attorney General and the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works. Hemmed in to the north and south by a people owning a different allegiance to our own; forced back to the sea to west, the only direction in which loyal hearts can turn is to the rising people of the east, who ask us to unite in a friendly spirit with them, to form a great Nation. May that union prove a source of strength to us and them.

I shall give to the Government measure a hearty support, reserving, however, to myself the right of suggesting any amendments or improvements, or of supporting any recommendations which may appear to me to be necessary or desirable.

From the position which I hold in this Council as an Officer of the Government, I have deemed it right to make this statement of the course which I propose to follow in this great and momentous subject, and I maintain it to be perfectly conscientious and perfectly consistent with my previous conduct.

The Hon. Mr. DEWDNEY, Member for Kootenay, rose and said:—Mr. President, I have purposely waited until this late stage of the debate in order to avail myself of the opportunity of listening to the arguments that have been adduced both for and against the scheme of Confederation as sent down for our consideration by His Excellency the Governor, and particularly for the reason that I have not been in a position (from my long absence in the Upper Country) of making myself acquainted with the subject as I should like to have done

As the debate progressed, I felt more and more that I had been right in so doing, as I have now the benefit of the well considered opinions and arguments of so many Honourable Members; and upon these able arguments I have in a great measure been guided in coming to the conclusion which I propose to explain.

And now, Mr. President, I think it is incumbent on me to state the course I intend to take with regard to the subject.

I feel I have a most responsible duty to perform, not only to my constituents, but to myself and the country generally.

With regard to my constituents, I feel that I am placed in a rather peculiar position, and I regret that I have had no opportunity of communicating with them since Confederation has assumed the phase it now does.

You are aware, I presume, Mr. President, that I was selected, unsolicited on my part, to represent the Kootenay District in this Council. At that election Confederation was made the test question, and I can assure you that at that time the feeling of the majority of my constituents was opposed to Confederation with the Dominion of Canada.

At a subsequent period—only a few months ago—a petition, concocted in this city, was dispatched to Kootenay for the purpose of obtaining signatures in favour of Confederation. It was, however, unfavourably received, the party circulating it was roughly handled, and the petition returned a blank. I mention this to shew you that up to a late period my constituents held the same views with regard to Confederation that they did some eighteen months ago.

Shortly after this petition had been dispatched to Kootenay, as just mentioned, I wrote to my constituents, requesting them to advise me fully with regard to their wants and wishes; and, in reply, I received a communication setting forth what they specially desired that I should assist in obtaining for them, but not one word on the subject of Confederation.

I have now before me the terms submitted by His Excellency the Governor at the opening of this Council, as well as the paragraph in His Excellency's Speech, referring to those terms; and I must say that had I resided as near my constituents as the Honourable Members for Victoria and Nanaimo Cities do to theirs, I should most certainly have sought an opportunity of meeting them and obtaining some expression of their opinions on the now altered position of this question. But as the remoteness of my District has rendered such a course impossible, it is only left for me to exercise my own judgment.

I wish to cast no reflections on the Hon. Members referred to, and with regard to the Hon. senior Mem-

ber for Victoria, I consider the action he has taken on this question only forces stronger and stronger on my mind, and I believe on the minds of the people, that any matter entrusted to his care will always be dealt with conscientiously, and with due regard to the feelings which he believes his constituents entertain.

Had I had an opportunity of submitting to my constituents the question of Confederation in the light that it now bears, I do believe that their opinions would be in unison with that of the country generally, in favour of Confederation on the terms now proposed, and being of that impression I intend to support the motion of the Hon. Attorney General. I feel assured that the vote which I am about give will meet with the approval of my constituents.

I should feel some hesitation in supporting the motion of the Hon. Attorney General, were it not for the assurance given in His Excellency's Speech, that the action we may now take will not be final until ratified by the general verdict of the people.

I trust I have now stated openly and fairly the position in which I stand, and the course I intend to pursue. I propose, Mr. President, to support Confederation with terms, and I believe that is the stand that will be taken by all the Hon. Members who support Confederation at all.

With regard to the terms proposed for our consideration it will be open for me to discuss them more particularly in Committee; but I may here state generally, that I consider they are only what the country is fairly entitled to demand, and I shall support them probably as they stand; and, at the same time, shall be ready to give my vote to any address that may be forwarded to His Excellency, recommending the insertion of other terms that I believe may be advantageous to the Colony.

Mr. President, I must now thank you for the kind attention you have shewn me in listening to the few remarks I have felt bound to make; and I have now only to say, that as soon as the terms are decided upon by this Honourable Council, and placed in the hands of His Excellency, I, for one, shall feel perfectly confident that future negotiations will be brought to a successful issue.

I have acted conscientiously in this matter, and I am sure I shall not regret the action I have taken as long as I live.

The Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN, Member for Victoria, in reply, said:—Mr. President, every word that I spoke I am willing to abide by, but I have no wish to be misrepresented. I never said that patriotism was dead in this Colony; and I have not yet advocated that closer Union with another country, to which allusion has been made, as the other issue to come before the people; but a strong feeling does exist in favour of that other Union, and it is just as well that the Dominion Government should know that there are very many people in this Colony who think that Annexation would be far more advantageous than Confederation, and who have no love for Canada. I maintain that the people of this Colony do not desire Confederation; they desire these glittering terms; take away or reduce the terms, and the people don't want Confederation—will not have it. I have never seen any programme proposed by the Confederation party, and it is certainly to the credit of the Government that it has sent one down [Hear, hear,] which has taken even the Confederationists by surprise. I once saw a scheme brought before this House, which included no Railway, no Dry Dock, a small Subsidy, and the Dominion Tariff, objectionable as it is acknowledged now to be. It was defeated. The new scheme asks more, and so the country has gained by the delay.

But, Sir, the Hon. Members of this Council have been arguing as though these terms had been obtained—aerial castle building. I say they are only propositions. I have not heard one Member say those terms must be had, or no Confederation.

[Hon. Mr. DeCosmos,—I stated yesterday, that if certain terms were not granted I should oppose Confederation.]

I expect to see you an opponent of Confederation before long; probably we shall change sides [Laughter]; but until these terms, or terms that will be satisfactory to the country are arranged, I shall not cease my opposition to Confederation. I think it necessary to say a few words in explanation of my position. I do stand here a Member of the Executive Council, whether I gave in my resignation or not, is not for the Hon. Member for Victoria District to know; I shall not gratify his curiosity; he should recollect, however, that party Government does not exist here.

I have opposed the Government on Confederation. I think it probable that when the terms come back from Canada they will bear but little resemblance to themselves; so until the Country is satisfied I will oppose Confederation. It is sufficient that the ultimate issue now rests with the people themselves; and I hope they will band themselves together to demand these or better terms.

Thus far the question is lost to me in this Council. I am beaten by the Imperial Government, by the Canadian Government, by Lord Granville's despatch, but more than all by the alluring terms and a Government majority,—by no one else. In this Council, the Executive Council has repeated itself. I intend now to offer no factious opposition to the conditions, but it will be my duty to point out what I consider faults, and though I will support the terms as they are, or nearly so, others must go in. I will not attempt to introduce anything which Canada cannot concede; so that on the one hand, Canada may have no excuse to refuse to accept the terms, and on the other, if Confederation does come it may come accompanied with conditions that will be beneficial to the material interests of the Colony. I now bide my time; when the terms as agreed to by Canada return, the people may find them changed, and not so attractive and enticing as they now appear.

In going into the Executive Council, I did so at a loss to myself. [Hear, hear, from the Hons. Attorney General and Chief Commissioner.]

After all, the Supreme Power hath made of one blood all the nations of the earth, and hath determined beforehand the bounds of their habitations. We are but instruments in carrying out this design, whatever it may be.

In the position which I now occupy, I have sacrificed no principle, forfeited no pledge, maintained my own honour, have done my duty, and I hope some good, to this Colony.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL said:—Sir, In rising to reply, I have to acknowledge and thank the members of this House for the care and attention which they have bestowed upon this great and momentous question, which I have had the honor to introduce to their notice.

With regard to the very decent, flattering, and personal remarks towards myself, in which the Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) has been in the habit of indulging for several years past, the House is so familiar with that gentleman's habit towards all his political opponents in that respect that it has learnt to estimate them at their proper value. I will not, therefore, waste the time of the House by any further comment on them. I will not condescend to notice them [Hear, hear, hear, hear] but proceed to subjects of more general interest.

I maintain, Sir, that liberal Representative Institutions for this Colony are not dependent on the success of the scheme of Confederation; they are in no way connected with it. Confederation is, however, the easiest and quietest way of getting Responsible Government, should that be found after deliberation to be really desired so ardently by the whole community as some Hon. Members aver. To those who conscientiously believe in Responsible Government, and that the real desire of the Country is for it, or as the Hon. Member for Victoria District says is a "unit" for it, I say fling in your voice with us; these Resolutions will most speedily assure the result you desire. If the people, after careful deliberation and full information on the subject, whether we be confederated with Canada or not, really desire Responsible Government, they will have it. Their voice will be heard on this particular question, as on all others connected with Confederation. But it is the hollowest pretence to assert that Confederation should be stopped till the Governor can send down a scheme for Responsible Government. If we do not get Confederation we shall still have our own Representative Institutions, and once possessed of Representative Institutions under the Imperial Statute of Victoria, the Colony will, if it be such a unit as described, be able at once to get Responsible or Party Government. Now, I earnestly deprecate, on the part of the Government, the unfair allegation which one Hon. Member has so improperly insinuated that the Government or Government Officials considered the *people* of British Columbia unfit for self-government.

Why, Sir, neither the Governor nor any member of the Government, or any other Official, ever said or thought that the people of this Colony were individually or collectively unfit for Responsible Government. The utmost that has ever been said on this side of the House has been that, under the present *circumstances of the Colony*, it would be unwise, excessively costly—nay impracticable. As I have said before, and again repeat, the Governor has no power of himself to alter the Constitution. He can only refer it where it has already gone, to the decision of the Queen in Council, which we ought in common justice to await before bringing forward any Resolution for Responsible Government. Now, how would the Country, if a unit on this point, get Responsible Government after Confederation? After Confederation the people can have Responsible Government, if they desire it, under clause 92 of the "British North America Act, 1867," by which power is given for the Provinces to change their own Constitution.

The Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken), has alluded to the Hon. Member for Victoria District having prepared a scheme for Confederation, now on the Journals of this House, which did not contain any reference to Responsible Government, or the Overland Railway, possibly in view of this very section 92 of the Organic Act. The Hon. Member for Victoria District may have considered that Confederation would, as a natural consequence after Union, bring Responsible Government. If so, I trust he will vote with us now, [Hear, hear, hear.] and leave a matter of such importance to be settled, not by a House constituted as this is, but by a House containing a majority of Representative Members elected by the country, after the question of party Government has been specially submitted to the polls.

I ask the House to deal with this subject on its merits, apart from all side issues, such as the special form of the Government which is to subsist at the time of Union, which is really not now before us. I ask them to place a generous trust in Canada. I acknowledge the encouraging manner in which the Council has dealt with this question, and sincerely trust that all parties and sections in the House, setting aside all prejudices and sectional issues, will unite cordially, frankly, and unanimously in giving a generous support to the Government, and thus strengthen their hands for the country's good in all future negotiations. [Hear, hear, hear.]

The Hon. Mr. Drake, junior Member for Victoria, asked permission to withdraw his amendment.

Leave having been granted, the amendment was withdrawn.

The motion of the Hon. Attorney General to go into Committee was then put, and carried unanimously.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole on the Confederation Resolutions, and immediately rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Leave was granted to sit again on Monday, at one o'clock.

*Reported for the Government of British Columbia, by*
W. S. SEBRIGHT GREEN.
*March*, 1870.

---

VICTORIA, B. C.:
PRINTED AT THE GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE.

V. R.

# The Government Gazette Extraordinary.

## BRITISH COLUMBIA.

VICTORIA, B. C., MAY, 1870.

## Legislative Council.

### DEBATE IN COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE ON THE CONFEDERATION TERMS.

MONDAY, 14TH MARCH, 1870.

The House having resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on the Confederation Resolution, as arranged by His Excellency the Governor of British Columbia, the Hon. Mr. Ball in the Chair,

On the motion of the Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL, the Chairman read the Resolutions through.

The Hon. the ATTORNEY GENERAL said:—Sir, I rise to propose the adoption of the Resolutions as sent down to the House, having as its object the Confederation of this Colony with the Dominion of Canada. I desire to consult the wish of the Council as to the particular mode in which the terms should be discussed, whether as a whole or in detail, paragraph by paragraph. But before doing so I think it right, Sir, to make a few brief remarks on the Resolution as a whole. The conditions have been prepared with great care, and after the exercise of deep thought and mature deliberation on the part of His Excellency the Governor and the Executive Council. The subject is one of so large a nature, and of such paramount importance, so many interests both here and in Canada are at stake, and the issues involved are so extensive, that I sincerely hope that all Hon. Members will bring to its discussion an earnest desire to combine their individual efforts to work out a successful result, and to throw aside, for such an occasion, all former prejudices and distrust; and as we have unanimously affirmed the principle, the House is committed to Confederation in the abstract ["No, no," from Hons. Helmcken, Wood, and Drake.] Well, I think so, and the House will think so too. It has so voted. However that may be, I hope that we can all now act harmoniously together, and see whether we cannot now turn out such a scheme as will work well in practice; be just and equitable to Canada, who will certainly be just and equitable to us, and yet be so favourable to this Colony as to insure the terms ratification when submitted to the popular vote. All Hon. Members, whatever their opinions, desire the same thing, namely to get the best terms practicable for the Country; and the proposition now sent down, which is based upon the "British North America Act, 1867," contains, I submit, the best terms that can be devised, and will give the Local Government as large an annual balance of cash for local purposes as we can venture to ask. There is one danger against which I think it my duty to warn Hon. Members, and I do particularly caution those who favour the idea of Confederation against attempting to weight the conditions by additional suggestions and recommendations so as to overload them, and against suggesting alterations in the terms which could not be granted by Canada. I believe we are all equally anxious to gain good terms, and we should be careful not to take away from the interest of the proposition before us by suggesting any other conditions that are not of material importance. I have observed a report in a newspaper of the previous proceedings of the Council, if I may be allowed to notice it without producing the paper, in which an Hon. Member is stated to have said, that any amendments of the Resolution would be accepted. I think it right to say, on behalf of the Government, that, while the Government can not consent to imperil the the unity of their scheme by amendments, they will still be happy to receive, and fully consider, all suggestions of a practical and reasonable character; and I invite Hon. Members to bring forward such suggestions, particularly such as will be calculated to remove any of the disadvantages of the scheme, and so to improve its working and insure its more general acceptance. As the majority of the Council seem to be in favour of dividing the Resolution into parts, and discussing it paragraph by paragraph, I will follow the suggestion. I, therefore, now propose the adoption of the first paragraph:—

"1. Canada shall be liable for the Debts and Liabilities of British Columbia at the time of Union."

These debts and liabilities, I would explain, include all the actual debts of the Colony now matured and due, as well as the liabilities for debts to mature at a future day. I will quote from the Returns sent down this day by the Governor, which give the full details of these liabilities, showing that our funded debt, on the 10th of March instant, consisted of the British Columbia and Vancouver Island Loans secured by Act, amounting in all to $1,194,000, against which $346,820 has been paid and invested as a Sinking Fund in reduction of Loans, leaving a balance of $847,180 still to be invested, and a floating debt of all kinds of $319,000, including over

$40,000 Savings Bank deposits. This floating debt it is in contemplation to consolidate by a Statutory Loan, at a lower rate of interest, and to procure the money from Canada, which, as Hon. Members are aware, is now rich, or elsewhere. For this purpose the Governor proposes to submit an Ordinance for the approval of this House, conferring the necessary powers. Owing to the mode in which the Sinking Fund is invested, there is reason to believe that it will be paid off at least a year before the time stated. Regarded as a whole, our public debt is by no means extravagant, as compared with that of other countries; but in our isolated position as a young self-dependent Colony it is felt as a very heavy burden; of this burden, Confederation will relieve us; a benefit so apparent needs not a single word. Hon. Members are aware that this debt is a heavy tax upon the country, and prevents the undertaking of public works. The assumption of this debt by Canada, on fair terms, will not only relieve us of this burden, but will save us a large balance of cash, which will be available for public works to open up the country. I will now proceed to the next item.

Hon Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works (Mr. TRUTCH)—I would suggest that each clause should be discussed and passed separately.

Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCOSMOS)—No, no. Let us hear the Attorney General on the whole Resolution.

Hon. Member for Yale (Mr. BARNARD)—We shall not carry the matter so well in our minds if we take the whole together.

Hon. Chief Commissioner—I think that the clauses are so distinct that it will be better to take them separately.

Hon. Member for Victoria District—I would suggest, as one who has scarcely had an opportunity to read these Resolutions, I would rather hear the Government on the whole scheme.

Hon. Chairman—I think it better to put it to the House, whether these clauses should be discussed one by one.

On the question being put, it was carried in the affirmative.

Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. HELMCKEN)—I presume Clause 1. will be agreed to.

Chairman—Has any Hon. Member anything to say upon this clause?

Hon. Member for Victoria District—What is the meaning of liabilities in Clause 1., is it intended to mean financial liabilities?

Hon. Attorney General—Financial liabilities.

Hon. Chief Commissioner—There may be liabilities which are not debts; there may be some liabilities which will become debts, liabilities which are not matured.

Hon. Member for Victoria District—Unmatured contracts, is that the meaning?

Hon. Attorney General—Yes.

Hon. Member for Victoria City—I move that the word "public" be inserted before "debts."

Hon. Member for Victoria District—That would imply private debts.

Hon. Member for New Westminster—I don't think so. Mr. Chairman, there can be no misunderstanding, it would make the clause no plainer.

Hon. Attorney General—It is as well that I should add that these terms come down complete in themselves: as far as the Government is concerned they are incapable of amendment, but the greatest attention will be paid to suggestions. I think it better to state this, to avoid misapprehension.

Clause 1. was passed as read.

Hon. Member for Victoria District—I suggest that Clauses 2 and 3 be taken together.

Clauses 2 and 3 were then read by the Chairman:—

"2. The population of British Columbia shall for "the purpose of financial arrangements be estimated "at 120,000. British Columbia not having incurred "debts equal to those of other Provinces now consti-"tuting the Dominion, shall be entitled to receive, "by half-yearly payments in advance from the Gene-"ral Government, Interest at the rate of 5 per centum "per annum on the difference between the actual "amount of its Indebtedness at the date of Union "and the proportion of the Public Debt of Canada for "120,000 of the population of Canada at the the time "of Union."

"3. The following sums shall be annually paid by "Canada to British Columbia, for the support of the "Local Government and Legislature, to wit:—

"An Annual Grant of $35,000, and a further sum "equal to 80 cents a head per annum of the popula-"tion; both payable half-yearly in advance, the "population of British Columbia being estimated as "aforesaid at 120,000. Such grant, equal to 80 cents "a head, to be augmented in proportion to the in-"crease of population, when such may be shewn, "until the population amounts to 400,000, at which "rate such grant shall thereafter remain."

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL, in moving the adoption of these clauses said:—I would observe that this estimated population of 120,000 is nominal, and has been arrived at by comparison of the revenue and population, because in the absence of actual census, and to facilitate financial arrangements, it has been deemed best to calculate according to the revenue producing powers of British Columbia compared with Canada. Thus we have it officially from Canada, that her Customs and Excise produced $2 75 per head of her population; at the same rate, $2 75 per head, our Customs represent the same present revenue as a population of 120,000 Canadians produce. This estimate of 120,000, therefore, though nominal, is really just and fair, hence 120,000 population has been adopted as the basis of our financial calculations. The $35,000 in Paragraph 3, allowance for the general support of the Government, is an arbitrary sum adopted by Canada in negotiating with Newfoundland and New Brunswick. The allowance of five per cent. interest on the difference between our public debt and that of Canada, is arrived at in this way: we have it officially from Canada that her debt on February 9th, say 1st March if you like, amounted to $22 per head of her population. This would entitle us with 120,000 people, to come in with a much larger debt than our own, which at the time of Union would be, say, $1,000,000. The interest at five per cent. on these amounts would give us the annual allowance of $82,000 named in the papers before the House. The 80 cents a head on our population of 120,000, is the usual allowance prescribed by the Organic Act of Confederation. This constitutes the Financial Scheme, and although it is open to argument, it is about what we are entitled to receive, and what we must receive to place us in a fair position under Union.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS, after asking the Hon. Mr. Helmcken if he wished to speak before him, and receiving a negative reply, rose and said:—Mr. Chairman, in rising to speak to the Resolutions respecting the proposed subsidies to be granted by Canada, I may possibly be wasting my breath, and the time of this House; but although that may be the case, my duty to my constituents and the country demands that I should do so. With respect to Confederation, I have ever looked at it from one point: it must have a money value. ["Hear, hear," from Dr. Helmcken.] A great deal has been said about the form of government—about Responsible Government—but I say this: that every Government, whether responsible or irresponsible, must have money. It is impossible for the most perfect political system to move without it. Ways and Means must be provided. Now, I have always said, and I still maintain, in view of Confederation, that the amount that ought to be placed at the disposal of our Local Government when we enter Union, ought to be an annual surplus of $200,000, or nearly so, after having provided for the annual current expenditure of our Local Government: that is, for all the offices and services that must be kept up at the expense of the Colony, in order to keep it moving as a Province of the Dominion. We know by reference to the Estimates what they are; but in addition, there must be a certain sum provided for keeping in repair public works, such as the main-trunk road from Yale to Cariboo, and our public buildings. After these expenses have been defrayed, I should expect a surplus to the credit of the Local Government of about $200,000.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—As against $152,000 in the estimate accompanying the Resolutions?

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—Yes: some surplus of that kind would be about the proper amount, if we expect the Colony to be any better off after Union than before, and if we expect our Local Government to do anything towards developing the resources of the country. Now, Sir, how shall we get that surplus? By the proposition before us, for which the Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken) gets the credit as the originator? No, Sir. But I will not anticipate the answer to these questions. Let us first examine the Government financial scheme, of which the Hon. Member for Victoria is the financier. The first proposition made by the Government is that we shall assume for financial purposes that our population is 120,000. Now, Sir, I am one of that number

## ERRATUM

*To be read after the word "Confederation," Page 2, Column 2, Line 40:—*

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Mr. Chairman, I think that on these two causes depends the whole stability of our scheme; and as I believe them to be of very vital importance ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos] I trust I shall be excused if I offer a few remarks upon them, although it is possible I may travel over the same ground as the Hon. Attorney General has taken up in introducing these clauses. I say, Sir, that 120,000 may appear extravagant at first sight. The basis of the population of 1861 is taken as the basis on which other schemes rest; but that would not do for this Colony. It would not give us an equal advantage with other Provinces. It has, therefore, been found necessary to take some other basis. And here, Sir, I desire to say that I am permitted to inform this House that the Executive are very much indebted to the Hon. Member for Victoria City, who is also a member of the Executive Council (Dr. Helmcken), for his able assistance and suggestions in preparing this scheme. I trust that this Council will find that the Hon. Member has been most practical and ardent in his endeavours to obtain good terms, if he has not been an enthusiastic advocate of Confederation. With regard to the reasons for adopting the number of 120,000 as the basis of population, we ask something for undeveloped resources. The expenses of living in this Colony are much higher than on the Atlantic Coast; there is more per head paid for taxes here than in any other part of the Dominion; one dollar here is in reality worth no more, that is to say it goes no further, than one shilling in the Eastern Provinces; and one man here pays as much to the Revenue as four on the other side. The basis is in fact the basis of Customs paid by each individual in this Colony compared with the Customs Revenue paid per individual in Canada. Taking the estimate of the present year, the Canadian Customs and Excise yield $2 75 per head, on the present population; and our Customs being $330,000, is equal to $2 75 per head on a population of 120,000, upon comparison with Canada. Practically and equitably, I believe this to be a fair basis. It may be open to some logical objection, but I believe it is equitable. The estate which we propose to hand over yields at that rate, as we now farm it. We turn it over into the hands of those who are to manage it. It is not for us to consider how. If they reduce the Customs, it is nothing to us; we must have a basis as favourable as this. ["Perhaps more so,"—Hon. Mr. Helmcken.] Perhaps more so, as the Hon. Member says. The debt of Canada amounts to $22 per head on the population, and this on a population of 120,000 gives a debt of $2,640,000. We may claim to have our debt taken over on the same basis as other Colonies, as before Union can be consummated, we may expect our debt to be reduced to $1,000,000, leaving a balance of $1,640,000, on which we will have a right to claim interest at 5 per cent., that is to say: $82,000, as stated in the printed particulars now before the Committee. The subsidy of $35,000, is equal to that given to Newfoundland. Referring again to the printed figures, you will find that the amount of Revenue retained by British Columbia is $151,050, add this to the subsidies, including the Interest on the difference of the debt, amounting to $213,000, and we have a total Revenue of $364,050. As we shall be relieved of all expenses but $212,009 75, we shall have left a clear balance of $152,040 25 to be spent in local works.

NOTE.—By an error of the Reporter in transcribing his notes, the last four lines of the speech of the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works upon the Financial Scheme were added to the speech of the Attorney General, and the speech of the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works was left out in its proper place; and the words "the difference of" were omitted in the speech of the Attorney General, between the words "five per cent. on" and "these," in line 35 of the second column of page 2.—REPORTER.

who do not believe in
finance,—one of those wl
to found financial mensu
for in no department of
be maintained a stricte
than in the department o
resorts to fiction, no m
nor how patriotic, may j
as the Hon. Chief Comm
assumption of a populati
cal and untrue, yet the r
Sir, I do not think that w
do I see the necessity for
population of 120,000 ins
it to be, as it is recognize
The magnitude of the sul
the terms, the dignity of
nobleness of the work of n
respect, ought to lift us
assumption and fiction, o
rate and genuine politic
inspire us with such pur
ments as would stamp th
indelible marks of truth
and for ever shut out
associating our public m
ticians, instead of rankin
able statesmen. At the
not exceed 40,000, includ
ren.—Whites, Chinese, a
and 30,000 semi-civilized
estimate an Indian to be
consumer; but when we
population the males ar
females, and that in this
consumers, it would not
there is no unfairness in
tion—Whites and Indian
sumers in the Dominion.
population of 40,000, we
facts, and not on fictio
assumption of a populati
Mr. Chairman, proceed
proposition of the Hon. g
which is the Government
poses to get $152,000 sur
after the Union. The pr
produce this surplus, are
annual subsidy of 80 cent
tion, which is assumed t
basis of population would
subsidy of $35,000 per an
of 5 per cent per annum
the actual amount of the
date of Union, and the pr
of Canada for 120,000 of
the time of Union, which
annum; and, 4. the bala
(not including the Custom
go to the Dominion) estim
Now, Sir, I have already
population does not exce
the population of the Dom
1871, at 4,300,000, and th
the rate per head would
for our 40,000 people wou
of $800,000; and as our
Sinking Fund, would be
the Colony would enter t
about $250,000. So no r
the third source of reve
population. Again, if th
to enter with the same de
entered the Dominion, th
lation of 40,000 would
$1,000,000, leaving us
admission. No revenue
passing glance at the New
The debt per head allowe
admission was, we are t
Newfoundland, by those
and that was $27 77 per
$27 77 per head, would e
sion in 1871, to a public
$1,048,644, our public de
$62,156, on which, on th
of revenue, we would be
5 per cent. That differe
would yield only $3,10
$82,000 per annum, the es
So it is neither on the Ne
basis of fact, that the Ho
has framed the Gover

who do not believe in assumptions in matters of finance,—one of those who deem it to be dangerous to found financial measures on fiction instead of fact; for in no department of Government ought there to be maintained a stricter regard for truth and fact than in the department of finance. The financier who resorts to fiction, no matter how well-intentioned, nor how patriotic, may justly be doubted. It may be as the Hon. Chief Commissioner has said: that the assumption of a population of 120,000 may be illogical and untrue, yet the result may be equitable. But, Sir, I do not think that we ought to assume, neither do I see the necessity for assuming, that we have a population of 120,000 instead of 40,000, as I believe it to be, as it is recognized to be, and as it is in fact. The magnitude of the subject, the historical aspect of the terms, the dignity of the contracting parties, the nobleness of the work of nation-making, our own self-respect, ought to lift us above the atmosphere of assumption and fiction, ought to guide us by an accurate and genuine political standard, and ought to inspire us with such pure and lofty political sentiments as would stamp the financial terms with the indelible marks of truth, fact, and statesmanship, and for ever shut out the possibility of posterity associating our public men with mere parish politicians, instead of ranking them with enlightened and able statesmen. At the utmost, our population does not exceed 40,000, including men, women, and children,—Whites, Chinese, and Indians,—10,000 civilized and 30,000 semi-civilized. It would be a mistake to estimate an Indian to be equal to a white man as a consumer; but when we consider that in our white population the males are largely in excess of the females, and that in this country they are very large consumers, it would not be incorrect to conclude that there is no unfairness in making our whole population—Whites and Indians—as equal to 40,000 consumers in the Dominion. Starting, therefore, with a population of 40,000, we base our calculations on facts, and not on fiction, as in the governmental assumption of a population of 120,000. I will now, Mr. Chairman, proceed to deal with the financial proposition of the Hon. gentleman for Victoria City—which is the Government scheme—by which he proposes to get $152,000 surplus revenue for the Colony after the Union. The proposed sources of revenue to produce this surplus, are four in number, viz: 1. an annual subsidy of 80 cents per head of our population, which is assumed to be 120,000, and on that basis of population would yield $96,000; 2. a fixed subsidy of $35,000 per annum; 3. interest at the rate of 5 per cent per annum on the difference between the actual amount of the debt of the Colony at the date of Union, and the proportion of the public debt of Canada for 120,000 of the population of Canada at the time of Union, which is estimated at $82,000 per annum; and, 4. the balance of our present revenue (not including the Customs, Excise, Postage, &c., that go to the Dominion) estimated at $151,950 per annum. Now, Sir, I have already shown that our maximum population does not exceed 40,000. If we estimate the population of the Dominion on our admission in 1871, at 4,300,000, and the public debt at $86,000,000, the rate per head would be $20. Now, $20 per head for our 40,000 people would entitle us to a public debt of $800,000; and as our public debt, after deducting Sinking Fund, would be in 1871, about $1,050,000, the Colony would enter the Dominion with a debt of about $250,000. So no revenue can be acquired from the third source of revenue on the basis of 40,000 population. Again, if the proposed terms allowed us to enter with the same debt per head, as old Canada entered the Dominion, that is $25 per head, our population of 40,000 would only entitle us to a debt of $1,000,000, leaving us still in debt $50,000 on our admission. No revenue still. Let us now take a passing glance at the Newfoundland terms of Union. The debt per head allowed to New Brunswick on her admission was, we are told, accepted on behalf of Newfoundland, by those who negotiated the terms, and that was $27 77 per head. Now 40,000 people at $27 77 per head, would entitle the Colony, on admission in 1871, to a public debt of $1,110,800. instead of $1,048,644, our public debt then leaving a difference of $62,156, on which, on the basis of the third source of revenue, we would be entitled to draw interest at 5 per cent. That difference, $62,156 at 5 per cent, would yield only $3,107, a sum very far below $82,000 per annum, the estimate in the terms proposed. So it is neither on the Newfoundland basis, nor on a basis of fact, that the Hon. Member for Victoria City has framed the Government scheme of Union. I will now come, Sir, to the real point at issue. I will try with all fairness to discover whether there is or is not any ground on which to base the assumption of a population of 120,000. We have been told by the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works and by the Hon. and learned Attorney General that the financial calculations are based on the proportion between the receipts of Customs and Excise in this Colony, and the receipts from Customs and Excise in the Dominion of Canada. Now, Sir, from statistics in my possession, I find that the Customs of Canada yield $8,640,000. That amount, with a population of 4,300,000 would be equal to $2 per head per annum. Let us now see what the Customs Revenue yields per head in British Columbia. In 1869, the Customs were $342,126. The difference between the average per-centage of Customs duty imposed in British Columbia and in Canada is 7 per cent. less under the Canadian than under our tariff. Now, as we imported in 1869 $1,775,000, 7 per cent. on that amount would be equal to $124,250. If we deduct $124,250 from $342,126, our Customs receipts in 1869, we shall have $217,876, the total revenue Canada would have received from British Columbia in case we had been in the Dominion. If we divide this $217,876 by our population, 40,000, we shall have 5 and nine-twentieths per head; in round numbers 5¼. We can now easily discern the reason why the basis of population has been fixed at 120,000 for financial purposes in the Government scheme of union. It is apparent that the Government estimate of population has been founded on the conclusion that in British Columbia the Customs would be about $6 per head, and in Canada $2 per head, or three times higher here than there, and therefore our population of 40,000 ought for financial purposes to be 120,000, or three times greater than it really is. If there were not reasons for the opinion that under Confederation the Customs and Excise of the Dominion as applied to this Colony would not perceptibly exceed the rate per head in the Dominion East, I would cheerfully assent, for financial purposes, to the assumption of 120,000 as our basis of population. I cannot, however, conscientiously do so, for with the extension of the Dominion to the Pacific, I hold, will come the equalization of political rights, and the equalization of taxation. The equalization of political rights will be established with the extension of the Dominion; but equalization of taxation, though it may not come in the first year after union, yet it is bound to come within two or three years after union shall have been proclaimed. In proof of this assertion, I could direct the attention of the Council to what I deem facts. 1. That as soon as union shall have been proclaimed, Canadian manufactures will enter our ports duty free, and that the reduction of Customs receipts from this source will, on the basis of our imports for 1869, be $58,400 per annum; 2. The reduction of Customs receipts after union, for Canadian produce entered duty free, and by the increase of agricultural produce in the Colony, will be, on the imports of 1869, $66,100. Now these two reductions are equal to $124,500, and if we deduct $124,500 from $217,876, the amount that has been assumed by Government that Canada would draw from this Colony in Customs receipts, we shall have only $93,376; and thus $93,376 will be only a fraction more than $2 per head for our 40,000 population, very nearly the same rate per head of Customs taxation on the Pacific as on the Atlantic. I might enter into explanations at greater length to show the correctness of this conclusion, but I deem it undesirable. The certainty of the equalization of taxation all over the Dominion renders the assumption of a population of 120,000 for financial purposes a pure fallacy, and nothing more nor nothing less. It is simply taking a temporary, a transitory state of things; a state of things that will pass away in a year or two, as the basis for permanent conditions. Besides there is a serious disadvantage in assuming that we will pay $6 per head per annum in Customs duty to the Dominion after union; and it is this:—Nearly every one would like to see all kinds of foreign merchandize, except such as would enter into competition with home-grown produce and home-made manufactures, entered duty free in Victoria, in order to foster and extend commerce. Now, if the Dominion Government made such an exemption from Customs for our benefit, it is but natural that we should make good to Canada in some other way what her revenue would lose by such an exemption. If Vancouver Island were exempted from Customs, and its population were taken to be 20,000, the Local Government would be expected to pay to the Domin-

ion, $6 per head, or $120,000 per annum for the exemption. But if instead of the temporary rate of $6 per head, the permanent rate of $2 per head were taken, the 20,000 people of Vancouver Island would only have to provide $40,000 per annum in lieu of $120,000, a saving of $80,000. The advantage of adhering strictly to facts instead of fallacious assumptions, are consequently perceptible to every one. By following facts we can have a scheme of union with a true correllation of parts, a thing impossible if we follow the proposed assumptions. I have stated that $93,376 is all the Revenue that Canada is likely to receive in Customs from British Columbia on the basis of Population and Imports of 1869. Now if a wide margin be allowed, and these figures be raised to $120,000 per annum, it would only, at $2 per head, entitle us to a population of 60,000. That population would entitle the Colony to a debt of $1,200,000, or only $150,000 in 1871 over our present debt, and on which the interest would be but $7,500 per annum. It is useless for me to follow the matter further to show that the financial terms are not based on correct premises. But before I conclude this section of the subject, I would remark that I have not taken into account the amount of Internal Revenue, such as Excise, Postage, Stamps, Malt Tax &c, that the Colony is likely to contribute to the Dominion Treasury; for so far as I can estimate the rate it will not exceed $1, or $1 25 per head, and offers little or no grounds on which to base financial terms. The only difference, it appears to me, between the Customs and Internal Revenue Laws of Canada, as applied for Revenue purposes to this Colony is, that the Internal Revenue Taxes are likely to be from the date of our admission, at the same rate per head here as in other parts of the Dominion; whereas the Customs will be higher here per head for a few years than there. Turning now, Sir, to that portion of the financial terms that proposes to get $151,050 from sources of revenue to be reserved after union to the Colony, I cannot help thinking that there has been a mistake all through the governmental scheme, and that the amount of revenue proposed to be obtained from those sources is another instance of governmental blundering. As I sum up these sources of revenue from the Estimates of 1870, they are as follows:—Road Tolls $50,000, Land Sales $6,000, Land Revenue $4,000, Rents $1,500, Miners' Certificates $11,000, Mining Receipts $12,000, Spirit Licences $25,000, Trading Licenses $15,000, Fees of Court $4,200, Fees of Office $6,050, and Vancouver Island Road Tax $6,000, making a total of $141,250, instead of $151,050, as in the governmental estimate submitted with the proposed terms of union. The way in which I make the difference, is by not taking into account as permanent sources of revenue, such items as arrears of Vancouver Island Real Estate Tax $8,000, Over-payments recoverable $500, Sale of unserviceable Stores $1,500. There can be no grounds for including such accidental sources of revenue under the head of permanent sources of revenue. Hence we must reduce the $151,000 of local revenue to $141,000. But the latter amount must also be reduced by deducting the Vancouver Island Road Tax $6,000 therefrom, thus leaving only $135,000 as permanent sources of revenue; for if the Vancouver Island Road Tax be included in our estimate of permanent revenue, we ought also to include the annual revenue of the cities of Victoria and New Westminster, which is simply absurd. The Vancouver Island Road Tax is a purely municipal matter, and so the Government has blundered in mixing up municipal with provincial revenue. The Yale-Cariboo Road Tolls are estimated as a permanent source of revenue at 50,000 dollars. This is another mistake, for the Road Tolls are falling off every year. In 1868, they were 67,825 dollars; in 1869, 46,500 dollars; and in all probability will be much less in 1870; and as mining diminishes in the upper country, year by year, so will the Tolls. If ever the proposed Railway be built, away go the Tolls altogether. Besides that, the present Road Tolls are oppressively high. On the receipts of last year, they are equal to 150 dollars per waggon load of 6,000 lbs., or 2½ cents per lb.,—an enormous tax, that no one in his senses would ever think of regarding as permanent. If any toll at all were levied permanently, it could not be fixed at a higher rate than one-sixth of a cent per pound, or 10 dollars per load of 6,000 lbs., from Yale to Cariboo. At that rate the Road Tolls instead of yielding 50,000 dollars per year, would only produce 3,333 dollars, which for all practical purposes might as well be abolished, for the cost of collection would exceed the receipts. For another and all important reason, I think a great mistake has been made in entering the Road Tolls as permanent revenue after union. It is this: the entire people of the upper country have determined to abolish the Road Tolls as soon as possible. No compromise will be accepted. So under this head our future revenue cannot be estimated higher than 3,333 dollars, or nothing. The revenue from Land Sales is also put higher than we are justified in fixing it. In 1868, the receipts under the head of Land Sales were only 1,200 dollars; in 1869, 5,564 dollars; and as permanent revenue, for all time to come, under union, at 6,000 dollars. Now, as it is alike our policy and our interest not to make Land Sales a source of revenue, I do not think that we would act judiciously in considering the terms of union if we estimate a higher amount of permanent revenue from this source than the receipts of 1869, 1200 dollars. Neither Land Revenue nor Rents appear to be as uncertain in their returns as Land Sales, so I will pass on to the items of Miners' Certificates, 11,000 dollars, and Mining Receipts, 12,500 dollars. Here again it appears to me another mistake has been made. Such gold mines as are worked in British Columbia will be worked out. Such diggings are sure to be deserted in a very few years. The white miners will retire, and the Chinese will take their place. When the Chinaman leaves, the mines are worked out. I can, therefore, see but little hope of permanent revenue from the gold mines. Already the mining revenue has begun to fall off. In 1867, Miners' Certificates yielded 13,645 dollars; in 1868, 11,535 dollars; in 1869, 10,500 dollars, and is likely to be less in 1870, although the estimate is 11,000 dollars. In 1867, Mining Receipts were 22,208 dollars; in 1868, 15,756 dollars; in 1869, 11,500 dollars, and yet for 1870 the estimate is 12,500 dollars. At the utmost, from all departments of mining, we cannot, in my opinion, estimate higher than 10,000 dollars as permanent revenue, and but little of that amount will ultimately be drawn from gold-mining. Now, Sir, with respect to Spirit Licenses, which have been estimated by the Government at 25,000 dollars as permanent revenue; there could be no greater blunder made. The Hon. gentleman who framed these terms seems to have had no notion whatever of the systems of taxation that obtain in the Dominion, and has consequently repeated his mistake of mixing Municipal Taxation with Provincial. In the Dominion there are three forms of Government viz: Municipal, Provincial, and Dominional, and each has its own system of taxation. Here we have but Provincial and Municipal Governments, with their respective systems of taxation. Now it appears that consideration has only been given, in framing these terms, to taxation under the Customs and Internal Revenue Laws of the Dominion. But Provincial Taxation ought also to have been considered, and the starting point should have been the equalization of our Provincial Taxes, with the Provincial Taxes of the Eastern Provinces. This is made very apparent with respect to Spirit Licenses. Here the Provincial Government levies 200 dollars per annum on retailers in towns, and in the country 50 dollars per annum. In Ontario the retail spirit license is 20 dollars per annum in cities, 17 dollars in towns, and 10 dollars in the country. In estimating our future Revenue from this source, we are not justified in placing it higher than the rate of Ontario, and that would reduce the receipts from Spirit Licenses from 25,000 dollars, to about 6,250 dollars per annum. The excess above the latter amount, if levied, ought to be levied for Municipal purposes. The Trade License here is also estimated too high. Now, after careful study of these sources of Provincial Revenue which it is proposed that the Colony, after Union, shall exclusively possess, I cannot make the permanent receipts higher than 50,000 dollars per annum. The difference therefore between my estimate of Provincial Taxation, and that of the framer of these terms, is 101,050 dollars, or as 151,050 dollars is to 50,000 dollars. If a larger amount than the latter be levied by our Provincial Government after admission, our taxes will be out of proportion to the taxes in the Eastern Provinces for Provincial purposes. Before propounding what I consider ought to be the financial terms of Union, I will conclude this part of the subject by stating that the terms submitted in the Resolutions, and illustrated by the printed Estimate, instead of giving the Colony a permanent total revenue of $364,050 per annum, will only produce 248,567 dollars, unless higher provincial taxation be levied here than in other parts of the Dominion. The

way in which I make up these results is as follows:—By the terms submitted by the Government, there is 1st. Fixed subsidy 35,000 dollars; 2nd. Interest on difference of Public Debt, 82,000 dollars; 3rd. 80cts per head on 120,000 population,96,000 dollars; 4th. Reserved revenue, 151,050 dollars: Total 364,050 dollars. By my interpretation of the proposed terms, there is: 1. Fixed subsidy, 35,000 dollars; 2. 80cts. per head on 120,000 people, 96,000 dollars; 3. Interest on difference of debt, taking 20 dollars per head as the debt of Canada 67,567 dollars: 4. Reserved Revenue, 50,000: Total 248,567 dollars. Now, if we deduct from the latter amount, the Government estimate of current expenditure, viz: $211.009, there would only remain a surplus revenue of 36,558dollars, instead of 151,050 dollars, as anticipated. I therefore sincerely think that the Government scheme is wrong, and ought to be revised. Mr. Chairman, I therefore propose to bring under the notice of the Council, what I consider ought to be the financial terms, taking for granted always, that Canada will become liable for our public debt at the time of admission. When the Provincial Delegates met in Quebec and London, to decide on the terms of Confederation, they divided the Provinces into three groups, viz.; Upper Canada, Lower Canada, and the Maritime Provinces. Lower Canada was taken as the initial point. Now, Sir, in deciding finally as to the terms, I consider that British Columbia ought to be treated as the fourth group, whilst the North-west Territory may be regarded as the fifth. The first thing that strikes me, on looking at the Eastern Provinces, is their territory. Ontario has 121,260 square miles; Quebec has 210,000; and all the Maritime Provinces, 88,065. Territorially then, we are their equal, and greater than either of them. The natural capacity of our territory to support population, is as great as Lower Canada. We have a finer climate, and more varied natural resources. Quebec sustains a population of about 1,250,000,or more. Ontario has 2,000,000. It is true that they are two centuries ahead of us, and we are in our infancy, with a handful of people. But that is no reason why, in framing terms, that we should not look forward to the rapid developement of the Colony, and to the possession of a large settled population. Considering our geographical position, our natural resources, our wide spread population, and our future, I think that we are entitled to as large a fixed subsidy as Ontario, that is $80,000. The proposed terms, submitted by the Government, ask only $35,000 per annum. Now, this is placing British Columbia, with its 220,000 square miles, its great natural resources, and the best climate in the world, on a par with Newfoundland, with its 40,000 square miles, its sterile soil and inhospitable climate,—a country that has never yet developed any capacity for anything but catching and selling codfish. Prince Edward's Island is also offered a fixed subsidy of $35,000 per annum,—a little insular community with a territory of 2,100 square miles, a hundred times less in area than our own country, and with a climate far inferior to ours. It is simply absurd to propose such a thing as ranking this Colony in subcidies with either of the Provinces except Ontario. I want neither more nor less than what the latter Province gets as a fixed annual subsidy. Every Hon. gentleman present who gives the matter a moment's consideration must agree with me that $35,000 is entirely out of the question, and that the least we can accept is a fixed subsidy of $80,000 per annum. [Hear, hear.] In the next place, I propose that our population be taken at 40,000. and at no time shall it be considered less; and that we shall be entitled to receive 80 cents per head annually until our population shall have reached 1,000,000. By this proportion we have truth and fact on our side. Our population will be subsidized at its actual number and not increased by a fiction—an unnecessary assumption—as in the terms proposed. Under this head we would get on entering the Dominion $32,000 per year. Besides that, as our population increases, this *per capita* subsidy would increase annually in amount, till it reached the maximum number of inhabisants of 1,000,000, and then it would stop. Now, the terms sent down to us by the Government assume, as I have shown before, the existence of a population of 120,000, and propose that we shall receive 80 cents on that number at once and that we shall receive no increase till our population shall have actually reached and passed that number; so it may be twenty years or longer before our actual population shall be equal to the assumed population, 120,000; and in the *interim* the *per capita* subsidy will remain unchanged. But this is not all. The Government scheme proposes to limit our maximum population to 400,000, the same as in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and as proposed in the terms to Newfoundland and Prince Edward's Island, This is part of the same error made in copying the fixed subsidy. If we sum up the maximum of population entitled to a *per capita* subsidy in the four Maritime Provinces it will amount to 1,600,000. Now, if we rank our population with our extent of territory, we who possess three times as much territory as the Maritime Provinces, and equal capacity to support population, ought, at least, to be entitled to fix our maximum number of inhabitants entitled to the *per capita* subsidy at one million. [Hear, hear.] Now, Sir, neither of these two subsidies, nor both, would meet the current expenditure of the Government,—keep the necessary offices and services of the Colony moving. Both, only amount to $112,000 per annum, and we require at least $162,000 to meet current expenditure on the basis of the Estimates of 1870. But, as it accidentally happens, if we add the proposed fixed subsidy, $80,000, and the *per capita* subsidy, $32,000, to the reserved revenue, which I have previously shown ought not to be estimated higher than $50,000, we shall have $162,000 and nothing over,—no surplus to enable the Local Government to do anything to develop or settle up the country. If we were to receive nothing more than these two subsidies and reserved revenue, we would gain nothing by joining the Dominion. It would be simply jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire,—a change without financial improvement. Under such circumstances, I would oppose Confederation. Now, Sir, in addition to the fixed and *per capita* subsidies, I ask for a temporary subsidy of $150,000. [Hear, hear.]

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—For how long?

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—I ask for a temporary subsidy of $150,000 per annum, to be diminished annually in amount, in proportion as our population shall exceed 40,000. New Brunswick has a temporary subsidy of $63,000 for ten years. Nova Scotia a temporary subsidy of $82,000 for ten years. The grounds on which I ask a temporary subsidy for British Columbia are: firstly, that the cost of living here is greater than in the Eastern Provinces, and, consequently, public officers must be paid higher salaries, and necessary services cost more in this country than there; secondly, our country is very large, and our population is small and widely scattered, and, consequently, requiring a larger staff of officials than a more compact and more populous community might require elsewhere; lastly, we require the additional temporary subsidy on the highest of all grounds,—expediency, that has governed politics in all times and countries. Without a surplus of at least $150,000 per annum, the Local Government will be able to do nothing to advance the interests and settlement of the country. Confederation would soon prove itself a source of disappointment, if there were no money spent annually for public works, immigration, education, &c. A change, without financial improvement, would destroy all hope of any such thing as the loyal and cordial co-operation of our people with the Government of the Dominion. Expediency, therefore, demands the subsidy, and expediency justifies the demand. In concluding my remarks, Sir, on this subject, I will briefly contrast the terms proposed by the Government and the terms suggested by myself. The Government scheme, as I have shown, calls for only $248,567, instead of $364,050 as alleged. Of the former sum it can draw in subsidies $198,567, in lieu of $213,000 as intimated. Now, by the terms which I have proposed the three subsidies, viz: fixed subsidy, $80,000 per annum, *per capita* subsidy, $32,000, temporary subsidy, $150,000, would yield $262,000 per annum, and adding thereto the reserved revenue (the details of which have been explained) $50,000, the Colony on and after Union would have a Revenue amounting to $312,000 per annum. If we deduct $162,000, the sum required by the Estimates of 1870, to keep up and pay for our Provincial offices and services, and make the necessary repairs to certain roads and buildings, we will have a clear surplus of $150,000 per annum to be devoted to Education, Charity, Public Works, and Immigration. Besides which the equalization of taxation for Provincial purposes would reduce taxation at least $100,000 more. If we deduct the current expenditure of the Government, viz: $162,000 from $248,567, the actual total amount of Revenue to be received under the terms submitted by Government to the Council, the surplus Revenue will be $86,567, as against

$150,00 in that which I have proposed, making a difference between them, of $63,433. ["Hear, hear."] I shall hereafter move a Resolution suggesting the adoption of the terms that I have explained, and as an amendment to the Resolutions now under discussion. ["Hear, hear."]

The Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN, Member for Victoria City, said:—The Honourable gentleman says in fact, we should go to Canada and say we want $250,000. I say we don't want to be Confederated. Canada wants Confederation. We don't ask Canada, Canada asks us to be Confederated. I agree that we ought to have $250,000 from Canada at least. The Hon. Member who has just spoken, attempts to show that Canadian manufactures will come in free. Twenty years hence Canadian manufactures may come in, but I will not go into that question; why should Canada complain of her goods coming in, what she gains will be more than she loses. She desires a larger market for her manufactures, and she must pay us for that; she cannot complain that she is losing by supplying us with her manufactured goods. The Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) says that equalization of labor, and of value of property and productions, will come about. I admit that it may be so, but in my opinion it will not be for some years to come; if there is equalization of labor, there will also be equalization of taxation and offices. The Local Government can look after this when it happens. I do not suppose that Canada will be disposed to look at our terms critically; they are getting this Colony far too cheap, I think $250,000 is too cheap. The Hon. gentleman (Mr. DeCosmos) says that we should go to Canada and ask $80,000 per annum, because another Province has the same, and that this Colony, which is larger in extent of territory than the largest of the Provinces should, have $80,0000. But the Hon. gentleman must recollect that we do not produce revenue equal to what the other Provinces produce. With regard to the limit of population for the purposes of representation, I think 400,000 is too small, it ought to have been 1,000,000, not indefinite. 120,000 gives us the right to have eight members to represent us; this is a matter of expediency. There is a fault in the Resolution to which I will draw attention, it is this, that we do not get any increase of Revenue to the Colony until we get a population of over 120,000 persons. We have to calculate what our Revenue will be now under Confederation, and we cannot look for any increase for years to come. Which ever way we look at it, the figures come back to the same thing, we want $250,000, and there are several ways in which we can get it; in point of fact we ask Canada to lend us that sum of money.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—My proposition would give $650,000 more than the Government scheme and set free Internal Revenue for local or Municipal purposes.

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—The Hon. Member wants $150,000 now, and as the population increases the sum is to decrease.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—We should always have $150,000, with our present or a greater population.

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—The long and the short of the story is, that the two propositions amount to much the same thing. We go to Canada and say we want $250,000. According to this scheme, Canada will only be out of pocket $128,000. I say that Canada's expenses will diminish in two years from this time by $60,000, so that Canada will only be paying $68,000 a year. This is a very low rate of payment, far too low in my opinion. I say, Sir, that if one thousand miners go to Peace River this year, our revenue will be increased by $100,000, and if Peace River succeeds, "pans out well" as the saying is, I am quite certain that $250,000 a year will not purchase this Colony. If Peace River is a failure, Canada may get it.

The Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK said—Sir. I rise to support the motion of the Hon. Attorney General for the adoption of these clauses. I prefer the scheme put forward by the Government to that suggested by the Hon. Member for Victoria District; it is more statesmanlike, and deals with the subject in a larger manner. I agree with the Hon. Member who has just sat down (Mr. Helmcken) that there is a great probability of our having a large increase of revenue from the Peace River mines. It is impossible at present to form any opinion, beyond mere conjecture, on this head; but still I think we ought to be prepared for the contingency. I believe, Sir, that in a short time, the Dominion Government will be drawing a large amount of revenue from this Colony, probably a million, or a million and a half of dollars, and I am of opinion that provision ought to be made, by which the Province will derive some material advantage from that large increase. The United States Overland Railroad is producing such an effect as to turn California's attention to the Pacific Coast. I should be glad to see a scheme proposed, by which we should get back a part of any such increase of revenue, and if any Hon. Member will bring in an amendment, to secure to us some local advantage out of any such prospective increase of revenue, I will support it: failing such amendment, I am prepared to support the clause as it stands.

The Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS, Member for Lillooet, said, Sir, I rise to support the amendment of my Hon. colleague (Mr. DeCosmos). In my opinion, Sir, the magnificent, bold, and statesmanlike scheme propounded by the Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) has entirely demolished that of the Government. Hon. gentlemen have said much about Peace River mines, so much, that they would almost lead us to suppose that if Peace River was to fail in fulfilling the expectations that seem to have been formed respecting it, the Government measure would also be a failure. I say, Sir, that nothing is known about Peace River, which will justify any such expectations. It is folly to talk about the revenue to be derived from the Peace River mines; the amount of prospecting in that district has been too trifling to afford any data upon which to base even an argument or suggestion, so far as the terms, financially speaking, are concerned. I think that the proposition laid down by the Hon. Member for Victoria District, (Mr. DeCosmos) is worthy of the serious attention and consideration of this House. I should like, Sir, to see a scheme carefully laid down, which would involve no subsequent reflections and troubles, such as we have seen in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; it is better to go through all the squabbling and discussion that we have to do in this House now, than leave it to involve us in serious trouble hereafter.

Hon. Mr. BARNARD—The Hon. Member says that the scheme proposed by the Hon. Member for Victoria District has quite demolished that of the Government. I should be glad to hear the Hon. Member for Lillooet point out the distinguishing differences between the two schemes.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—The difference is apparent. I think that I have said enough to show this Council the advantages of the scheme propounded by my Hon. friend; if Hon. Members cannot see differences which are so plain, it is not for me to supply them with brains.

The Hon. Mr. WOOD said—Sir, I speak with considerable diffidence upon matters connected with finance. It is a subject which I have not made my particular study. The class of observations which I shall feel it my duty to make upon these clauses, will be more for the purpose of enquiring whether this Council has taken properly into consideration, the possibility of the population of this Colony increasing within ten or fifteen years to 100,000, or about that number, if such an increase should take place, with the debt of British Columbia paid off, as it will be by that time, Canada will gain enormously under these terms. Of the prospect of there being a large consumption of Canadian goods here, I can say nothing. I do not think it likely that the Railway will supersede sea carriage in bulky staples. There are great difficulties connected with the transport of any goods, and until the Railway is in operation, I apprehend that the bulk of our dry goods will come as heretofore, from England, whilst that class of unmanufactured articles, which we are now importing from America, will still be likely to come into the market cheaper than Canadian goods, even though they are subject to a tariff. It is the difficulty of transport, our isolation in fact, as the Hon. Attorney General has stated, and not the tariff which is the real and substantial impediment to trade. I cannot help thinking that it is the probable destiny of this Colony to be numbered by hundreds of thousands, rather than by millions. This is the ultimate part of the world. We are in this Colony further removed from the great centres of civilization than probably any other known portions of the globe; we may almost be called the last Country in the World; and it is probable that only exceptional articles of manufacture will come to us from Canada. The consumption of manufactured articles imported from England, which can produce every kind of manufactured article cheaper and better than Canada, is not likely to decrease. Canada cannot compete with the facilities afforded by England and the United States

in manufactures. With regard to the advantages to be derived by Canada from the terms, I take it that the present population of consumers in British Columbia is in reality about 25,000, instead of 40,000. As the population increases the Customs Revenue, which will always be the main source of income, will increase; the advantage, consequently, will be entirely on the side of the Dominion; their profits grow in proportion as our population increases, whilst their burdens are becoming less. Customs would increase and judicial fees would increase; in fact, with a population of 100,000, I think I am not far wrong in stating that Canada would take from $800,000 to $1,000,000 from this Colony in the shape of Revenue every year, and would leave British Columbia with an increased expenditure necessary for carrying on the local Government, without any corresponding increase of income. The clauses proposed show, in my humble opinion, a present temporary and uncertain advantage, against a certain and prolonged future loss.

Hon. Mr HELMCKEN—In Canadian calculations the Indians are reckoned as white men, therefore we have a population of more than has been stated, for the Indians alone exceed 40,000.

Hon Mr. ROBSON, Member for New Westminster, said:—Mr. Chairman, I have listened with interest to what has been said upon these clauses, and have endeavoured to follow the Hon. Member for Victoria District through his figures, and after hearing all, I am not prepared to think any the less of the Government scheme, for the remarks which have fallen from the Hon. Member, the scheme proposed by him as an amendment to the financial clauses of the Government indicate a vast amount of research, calculation, and thought. I congratulate the Hon. Member for Victoria District on the vast advance which he has made in the last two years. He then only asked for $142,000, inclusive of subsidy and head money. I think, Sir, that the Government has hit upon the soundest, best, and most feasible scheme. I consider it a real stroke of statesmanship, and am glad to find that the Un-Official Members of the Executive Council have added so much to its value. With regard to the number at which it is proposed to estimate the population, it is all very well for Hon. Members to say that this is a fiction, but there is nothing dishonest in the assumption. If we were going to impose upon the Canadian Government it would be dishonest, but we cannot impose upon the Government at Ottawa any more than we can upon ourselves, There is a real honest intent. The explanation of the Chief Commissioner is fair and satisfactory upon this point. The policy of the scheme proposed by the Government is less intricate than that of the Hon. Member for Victoria District; it is more business like. It is important also as a basis of representation. If we adopt 40,000 as a basis of population, we shall only be entitled to a much smaller representation. By fixing the basis at 120,000, we give the Country a better status abroad, and with the Dominion Government, than it could have if the basis were fixed at 40,000. This is where the fiction comes in if at all. Besides, we are upon the brink of great changes, which will enormously increase our population. We have every reason to expect our population to be doubled in a very short time. The public works which would commence immediately after Confederation will increase it at once, and it is fair to put our population up to meet the increase. There is, in my opinion, a great deal of reason in the arguments of those who say that as the population of this Colony increases the policy of the Dominion will tend to free trade ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos], and the Canadian Government look forward to the time, and that very shortly, that Internal Revenue or Excise will exceed the External Revenue or Customs, and the Customs Revenue of this Colony will not increase much above its present standard from the reduction of duties and the importation of Canadian goods. Hon. Members may look surprised at this, but I will tell them that there are large Canadian Houses now in negotiation with merchants of this Colony respecting the transmission of goods to this Colony, and I believe that cargoes of Canadian goods will come in to this port immediately after Confederation. This will be a relief to us. The Revenue from our own Customs will in a few years come to a stand still, or rather, notwithstanding the increase of our population, the Revenue will decrease. Looking ahead, it is argued by some Hon. Members that these terms look good for the present time, but bad for the future. I believe, however, that the bargain about to be made is a good one. Let us, if we can, strengthen the hands of the Government in asking more, but let us do nothing to weaken them and compel them to take less. We want more money just now. My idea is that the expenses of Local Government are set down at a figure which is unnecessarily high. I think the expenses might be considerably reduced, and thereby a saving made to the Colony. The subsidy of $35,000 is, I think, too small. I will, therefore, move to increase it to $50,000, and to increase the limit of representation from 400,000 to 1,000,000. I make this proposition with the more confidence because I believe that the Dominion Government will think very little of $15,000, but they might think a good deal of the $45,000 which would be necessary to increase the subsidy to $80,000. In regard to the mines of this Colony, I think they will be more lasting than some Hon. Members predict; and I also differ from those who think that our prosperity depends entirely upon our mines. I believe that there is a great future for the Colony. I believe that the mineral resources will last our time, and that of our children. I believe, also, that our agricultural resources may be developed so as to give us one million of population within ten years, and that this Colony will become of immense importance when the Overland Railway, the true North-west Passage, is established. I conceive that it is not at all an exaggeration to assume that this Colony will have a population of one million within our lives. With such a climate as we have, and with such natural advantages, this Colony has stood still at a marvellous rate.

The Hon. Mr. CARRALL, Member for Cariboo, said:—Sir, Hon. Members have said, and I think with reason, that the policy of the Dominion tends towards Free Trade. Excise Duties are gradually taking the place of Customs, and I incline to the opinion that the importation of Canadian goods will reduce the revenue of this Colony considerably, but in any case, if a surplus should accrue to the Dominion Government, then a proportion of that surplus should revert to us, so that it might be applied for local purposes. If the inequalities foretold should arise, then with such representation as we shall have, we shall have the means of securing a due proportion of the surplus. If the Canadian Government do not give us a fair share, we will force it from them. We shall be strong enough even with the number of Representatives proposed by these Resolutions. If the population really increases, as it is said it will, we shall have a vast representation. As regards the Indian population, it is roughly estimated by the Vicar-General at 60,000.

The Hon. Mr. DRAKE, Junior Member for Victoria City, said:—Sir, I do not think that the advantages to Canada have been fairly put; it has been said that the sum of $35,000 is an arbitrary sum similar to the subsidy allowed to Newfoundland, from the expenses of carrying on the Government of this Colony in proportion of the expense of the Government of Newfoundland in comparison to the population. I say that the sum is out of proportion and too small for the requirements of this Colony. I would put it up to $70,000. Canada will receive, after paying subsidies and expenses $128,000, Canada will no doubt fund the debt at a smaller rate of interest.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Canada cannot fund it at less.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—It is a matter of assertion, but I am of opinion that she will, and with the payment of debts in five years, Canada will pay out about $53,000 only a year, therefore I move a recommendation to the Governor that "$70,000" be inserted in the conditions, instead of "$35,000."

The Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER, said:—Mr. Chairman, I shall be glad, speaking for myself as an individual member of this House, to accept any reasonable suggestion, and shall not oppose the recommendation of the Hon. Member for New Westminster. With reference to the amount of our debt, the Government scheme gives the Colony the full benefit of the debts to come in. I say that the debt of British Columbia, after Confederation, cannot be funded, or the greater part of it cannot, for this reason, the debt is payable in Debentures which fall due at certain dates. After Confederation the price of Debentures will go up, and Canada can get no further benefit by funding, except as regards the Floating Debt. With regard to the remark of the Hon. Mr. Wood, who says the Resolution is framed with reference to present gain and future loss, I say we may wait and the horse may starve while the grass is growing. When we enter Confederation; we must do so in the expectation that we shall participate in all the advantages of Confederation, any increase of revenue or population will bring its share to us; we must believe that Canada will deal fairly with us,

New, Sir, I followed the Hon. Member for Victoria District through his figures when he propounded his new scheme, and I must say that I am better pleased with the Government measure than I was before; ours comes out on a stronger basis than before, in contradistinction to his. By his scheme he proposes to ask a clear gift; we ask much the same amount, but show the grounds. The Hon. Member has based his arguments on assumption more than the Government have. It is wrong to look upon the estimate of population as a fiction, it is not so, it is based upon calculation. Call it an expediency if you will, but it is no fiction. He seems to treat British Columbia as if it were an estate to be parted with for a *quid pro quo*, which is not a fair way of treating the subject. If Canada send us goods she will derive greater advantages from doing so than we shall, but nevertheless we shall participate. When our population increases rates of taxation will be reduced; a lower tariff, cheaper manufactured goods, and lower rents, are amongst the advantages that I look for out of Confederation. With regard to the Road Tolls, I look upon it as essential that they should be kept up to meet the expense of maintaining the roads and keeping them in repair. It has been a question, and perhaps it is still open for debate, whether the care and maintenance of the Main-trunk Road should not be thrown upon the Dominion Government; if we regard the road as Military work necessary for the defence of the country, its maintenance may fairly be a charge upon the federal revenue. I think we shall be in a better position to uphold the terms after this discussion. I believe that our future will be speedily prosperous, and I am quite satisfied that the Dominion Government should share in our prosperity. It will not do for us to depreciate our own future prospects.

The Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—I have not much to say in favor of Canada, but this much I will say: if British Columbia prospers by reason of Canada's works and capital, surely Canada has a right to an ample share of the increased Customs Revenue which will be so produced.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—Mr. Chairman, the credit of the Government proposition now before us has been given to the Hon. Member for Victoria (Mr. Helmcken.) Now, Sir, I am perfectly content that he should enjoy the credit, and the whole credit. In speaking briefly he has quoted a word used by myself—"expediency." Now, I again say the whole thing is a matter of expediency. I have not heard anything, however, either from that Hon. gentleman or others who followed me, to disturb the solid foundation of my scheme, resting as it does on truth and fact, and a plain out-spoken statement of our monetary requirements. I have always said that this question of Confederation was one of a monetary character—that it had a money value, and I maintain, as I have always done, without shadow of turning, that we ought to have a surplus revenue of about $200,000 on entering the Dominion. I have always said that we must have that surplus, or its equivalent, with Confederation, or else no Confederation. That is the point round which I have been revolving. I have made no stride in advance, none to the rear, the Hon. gentleman opposite to the contrary. I have ever kept before the public the same idea, that when the terms of union were negotiated, they must bring that sum in a surplus revenue into our Treasury. It was a simple point that every one could understand and not forget. It is the sum that I asked at first; it is the sum that I ask now; and it is the sum that I propose now in amendment to the Resolution of the Government. The real surplus in the Government scheme is so far below what it ought to be, that it will be repudiated as an absolute failure, if ever it comes before the people for ratification. They will reject it. It will create just as much dissatisfaction here as there was felt in Nova Scotia. I will now, Sir, as I promised, move the following as a recommendation to His Excellency, and in substitution of Resolutions 2 and 3:—

1. That the Council recommend to His Excellency the Governor, the following Resolutions for his consideration: 2. The population of British Columbia shall be estimated at 40,000. 3. The following sums shall be paid semi-annually by Canada to British Columbia for the support of the Local Government and Legislature, to wit:—An annual grant of $80,000, and a further sum of 80 cents a head per annum of the population, both payable half-yearly in advance, the population of British Columbia being estimated as aforesaid. Such grant of 80 cents per head to be augmented till the population shall be shown to be One Million, at which number it shall thereafter remain. Canada shall also pay to British Columbia, in semi-annual advances, the sum of $150,000 per annum, which shall from time to time be reduced in proportion as the population may exceed 40,000.

Hon. Member for New Westminster—I object to the basis of population being changed, otherwise I would support some part of the recommendation.

The Hon. Mr. ALSTON (Registrar General) said:—This being a Government measure, I shall support the Resolutions, but I shall at the same time be prepared to give my assent and support to any sensible recommendations that are proposed. It strikes me that the Resolution of the Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) is based on proper grounds. It is a mistake to say that the allowance for representation is based on a fictitious estimate of population. The Executive Council must have estimated it on the area and extent of the Colony. I believe that our representation would accord with the recommendation of the Hon. Member for Victoria District. I do not think that Canada is advancing in the direction of free trade. Her advance is more likely, in my opinion, to be towards protection. I have no doubt that Confederation will open the door for Canadian goods to be brought in. I have no hesitation in voting for a larger subsidy, because I believe that, in a few years, from the increase in our revenue, Canada will have very little to pay, and in the Government Resolutions there is no suggestion for any refund from Canada, if the Customs Duties should amount to a very large sum. I shall, therefore, vote for the Resolutions, but I shall support the recommendation of the Hon. Member for Victoria District, because I consider that it is grounded on common sense.

Hon. Mr. BARNARD, Member for Yale, said:—Mr. Chairman, I shall support the Government proposition as it stands, particularly the estimate of 120,000. New Brunswick, with a population of 250,000, is entitled to fifteen members in the Dominion House of Commons. If the basis of representation is to be taken from population, then 40,000 would only entitle us to two members in the House of Commons, instead of eight. For that reason, in my opinion, if for no other, 120,000 ought to stand. Besides, as a matter of fact, our population exceeds 40,000. There is not an Indian in the Colony who does not contribute as much to the revenue as a Canadian. They are entitled to be represented as well as white men. Eight Members in the House of Commons will give us, as has been suggested, almost the balance of power between parties; eight, standing firmly together, will have great influence, but what would be our influence with two?

After a few words from Hon. Mr. Humphreys, in support of the basis of population, as disclosed in the scheme of the Hon. Mr. DeCosmos,

The several recommendations of the Hon. Messrs. DeCosmos, Drake, and Robson were read by the Clerk.

Some discussion ensued as to how the vote was to be taken, and the Chairman decided to put the recommendations of Hon. Mr. DeCosmos first, by itself, and then the recommendation of Hon. Mr. Drake, which was an amendment on the recommendation of Hon. Mr. Robson.

The recommendation of the Hon. Mr. DeCosmos, on a division, was lost. Ayes 5, Noes 14.

The recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Drake, as an amendment to that of the Hon. Mr. Robson, on a division, was carried.

Clauses 2. and 3. were then passed as read.

On motion, the Committee rose, and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. DeCosmos voted against the Report of the Committee being adopted.

House adjourned at 6 p.m., until 1 o'clock on Wednesday.

---

WEDNESDAY, 16TH MARCH, 1870.

Committee sat at a quarter past one.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the adoption of Clause 4:—

"4. The Dominion shall guarantee Interest at the "rate of 5 per centum per annum on such sum, not "exceeding £100,000, as may be required for the "construction of a first class Graving Dock at Esquimalt."

He said, it is pretty generally known that a company was started for the construction of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt, and that negotiations with that object in view had taken place under a former admin-

istration, but although both the Admirals and Governor Seymour had reported in favour of it, the thing had fallen through, owing to the inability of the company to obtain the necessary funds. They were only able to get a small loan in aid from the Admiralty. The Dominion guarantee of 5 per cent. on £100,000 sterling, with a prospect of ultimate profits from the undertaking itself, will, it is believed, secure the whole amount of capital required, which has been variously estimated; but from preliminary surveys and investigations which have been made, the sum of £100,000 is deemed sufficient, and there is little doubt that if a company can get a guarantee for that amount, they can carry out the undertaking on the largest practicable scale. I am aware that some opposition has been expressed to the locality; but it is to be supported on general grounds. It will be general to the whole Colony. £100,000 cannot be spent in any part of the Colony without benefitting the rest of it. The Navy are at Esquimalt. Esquimalt is the first port which Ocean ships reach when they want repair, and the last point they leave when they receive sailing orders. Captain Richards, and all the Admirals from first to last, have reported in favour of Esquimalt for a Dock. Without Admiralty patronage and aid, the thing could not succeed. Another advantage in a Dock would be, that it would enable us to utilize our great white elephant—the Dredger. As to any opposition to the locality for Burrard Inlet and New Westminster, though as much interested as any Hon. Member round this Board in those places, I must say that they already have the larger share of benefit from the terms; for in my opinion the Overland Railway must follow down the main artery of the Colony—Fraser River—and have its terminus either at New Westminster or Burrard Inlet. Therefore, on public grounds, and because I believe that it will be a public benefit, I support the establishment of a Graving Dock at Esquimalt.

The Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK,—Sir, I rise to oppose this clause, because I deem it too sectional; all sectional views should be set aside. I think the locality should certainly be left out, and the question decided hereafter. I have no objection to getting all the money we can from Canada, but I am not sure that there is any present necessity for a Dock. I believe that for some time to come, it will be cheaper to send ships to San Francisco. What is wanted, is one of Clarke's patent Slips. We shall, before long, have plenty of ships at Burrard Inlet, and when the community requires it we shall have plenty of private parties ready to come forward to construct them. Both at Burrard Inlet and New Westminster, there is so great a rise and fall in the tide that they would be good places. I have been asked to support the substitution of Burrard Inlet for Esquimalt in the terms, but I will not do so. I would prefer striking out the name altogether. We ought, I say, to let go sectional ideas, and go in for the public good.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS said—Sir, I am at a loss to understand any opposition to this clause. Any such guarantee, if it led to the expenditure of so much money in any part of the Colony, will be an advantage to the whole community. It is an easily understood benefit. It will not, in my opinion, make much difference where it is built; perhaps it would be better to leave the selection of the locality to a Committee, who might indicate to the Canadian Government the best locality. I am of opinion that we want a Graving Dock, we don't want ships to go to San Francisco.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON, Member for New Westminster, said—I may, perhaps, be expected to oppose this clause, and ask for New Westminster to be inserted, but I shall not do so. I have no sectional feelings in supporting Confederation. I think the word Esquimalt is perfectly harmless, although like my Hon. friend (Mr. Holbrook) I should have preferred that no locality had been made. I do not think that naming the spot will, of itself, decide the question. The Dock will no doubt be built in the most suitable place. As the word is in, let it remain.

Hon. Mr. WOOD said—Sir, I agree with what has fallen from Hon. Members who object to the naming of the locality, and I shall move that the word "Esquimalt" be struck out, and the words "such place as the Dominion Government shall appoint" be inserted. I desire, if we are to have this organic change, that we should be free of sectional and local feelings of irritation. The naming of Esquimalt as the locality for the Dock, seems to me to be an endeavour to purchase the good-will of Victoria, whose population is known to be anti-confederate ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos]—of Victoria, which stood the test of Confederation at the last Election, and whose Members sit here pledged against Confederation. This is bidding for the favour of the Victoria constituency. ["No, no," from Hons. Attorney General and Chief Commissioner.] I judge of the effect which it is likely to have upon others by the effect it has upon me. I own some small portion of land at Esquimalt, at Constance Cove, near the probable site of the Docks, and that I confess has a softening effect upon me; and though I do not allow it to influence my vote, it does influence my mind. [Laughter.] Confederation, as the Hon. Member for Victoria (Dr. Helmcken) has said, means a Railway, Docks, and money; it means to each person the possibility of getting $1,000 at the end of two years, or $100 a month in rents. I do not believe that these terms will be submitted to, and if the inducements are taken away, I say the people will not have Confederation. If they do accept it under the inducement of material benefits, I fear that we shall very shortly see a strong feeling of reaction. Why should we name Esquimalt? what right have we to do so, if it is not intended to have effect on the Victorian interest? why not leave it open? If Esquimalt is named, it seems to me to tie down the Dominion Government to a locality of which they may not approve, and may be disadvantageous to the negotiation. The more that is left to the Dominion Government, the better is the chance of carrying out the negotiations successfully.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—What is the estimated cost of constructing the Docks?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—£100,000.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I think Mr. Chairman, that it is much to be regretted that the Hon. Mr. Wood has attributed not very creditable motives to the Government. ["Hear, hear."] I am sorry to have to say so. I am sorry I cannot congratulate him on statesmanlike qualities when he says he might have been influenced. I have never taken this view. I believe the influence of a vote never occurred to any Member of the Executive Council. I protest against such insinuations. I congratulate the Hon. Member for New Westminster upon the course he has taken, and on his support of the Government without reference to any sectional views. I feel bound to explain why Esquimalt has been named by the Government. The main object in asking for a Graving Dock there, is to secure the head quarters of the Navy, on the Pacific coast, within the Colony. When you come to remember that Esquimalt is the Naval Station, and has been for years, and when you come to consider that assistance is offered by the Imperial Government, it will not be difficult to discern that there was reason on our side. I could give you good commercial reasons, but it is sufficient to say, that the Government named Esquimalt, especially, with a view to the retention of the Fleet; both the late Admiral and the late Governor agreed in reporting in favor of Esquimalt; we should therefore have been remiss in not pointing it out. I think it hard that the Government should be twitted with the intention of catching votes. ("Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos) I scout the idea. There is an Imperial Act, which only allows the Admiralty to lend a limited sum to Colonial Docks. The Act of 28 & 29 Victoria, Cap. 206. This Act allows a loan of £20,000 from the Admiralty upon certain terms; it is a loan of so much money that is contemplated, and not a guarantee of interest. Last year I stated to this Council, that the Admiralty had offered to lend £20,000, at 4 per cent. The Company did not think it sufficient inducement. We hope to get Imperial assistance still, that is one reason for the locality being named. I stand here to say that Esquimalt is the place. I am surprised that a Member from the Mainland should bring an accusation of sectional proclivities against the Government in this matter, for the Railway will specially benefit the Mainland; I believe and hope it will follow down the valley of the Fraser, and immediately benefit the district from which the Hon. Member comes. Fraser River is the main artery, and the probable course of the Railway. I did not, therefore, expect to hear of any sectional prejudice in the Resolutions from any Member from the Mainland, when, if there is any immediate benefit to any special locality, it will be to the Mainland of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. RING, Member for Nanaimo, said:—Sir, I am prepared to support the Government upon this clause. Why should we set ourselves up in opposition to the opinion of the successive Admirals who have been upon this Station, and who can have no

prejudices? I think it is a waste of public time to impute motives. Esquimalt has been pronounced by Engineers to be the proper place. I am not one of those who, like certain Hon. Members here, would constantly "pin their conscience on their sleeves for daws to peck at." Such motives as are suggested, could never have entered into the minds of the Executive. They have been repelled by the Hon. Chief Commissioner, and why should we be accused of giving personal votes?

Hon. Mr. WOOD—No personal motives are imputed.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—It seems like such an imputation. I think the Hon. Member should withdraw his motion. Consider how such a principle as that suggested by the Hon. Mr. Wood would work. It in effect, amounts to this:—"Because you have a local interest, you must refrain from supporting by your vote what you conscientiously approve of as beneficial to the community."

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I must correct my Hon. friend (Mr. Ring). I do not attribute personal motives in any improper sense; but I say, is there a butcher, or baker, or any other man who will, in these days of pressure, fail to vote as his pocket will be influenced? The material benefit to the individual is an influence at all elections, and rightly so. I can see, in my mind's eye, banners floating at the next general election, and can imagine placards posted with the inscription in the largest type: "Vote for DeCosmos and the Esquimalt Dock." This object may not be intentional, but yet can it be otherwise? What is it? Intending without intending? I deny that I impute any dishonest motive in the Executive, but it is clear that the Dock at Esquimalt will influence many votes, and I confess I gave them credit for foreseeing so obvious a consequence.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I say this, Sir, that if any such motives had guided the Executive Council; if any considerations, such as have been suggested, had swayed them; if the object had been a different one, we could have prepared a much more palatable dish; we could have shewn you pecuniary advantages. If we had had the intention to get votes, we could have framed the Resolutions very differently. But they were framed with no such views. It was the intention of the Government to prepare terms on a fair and proper basis, to be submitted to the people.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—As a Member of the Executive Council, Sir, I confess that I was pleased to see Esquimalt mentioned as the site for the Docks. I will meet the Hon. Mr. Wood on this issue, and say that supposing this is put in for the sake of gaining the vote of the Victoria people, what is Confederation? Confederation means union to benefit every part of the Colony. To follow out the Hon. Member's reasoning, there should have been no public works at all named in the conditions. I state that the insertion of Esquimalt in the Government Resolutions was not governed by sectional prejudices. The Executive Council took the broad view, that it was for the interest of the Canadian Government to build this Dock, because if Victoria prospers under Confederation, it will be so much the better for the Dominion revenue If the work is a benefit to Victoria, through bringing labourers, it will benefit the whole Colony, and our position will be improved, and therefore we shall become a more important part of the Dominion. If it pleases the people of Victoria, if they consider it a sufficient inducement to go into Confederation, let them do so. The people of Victoria are here to make money, and not to found empires; their children may perhaps make the kingdoms and empires. If the people like Confederation on these terms, I say let them vote for it.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL, Member for Cariboo—"It may not be intentional but it is so," were the concluding words of the Hon. Mr. Wood. I say yes. So far as this: that the whole of the conditions of this scheme were intended to benefit the whole of the Colony. As a Member of the Executive Council, I repudiate entirely the narrow motives which have been suggested by the Hon. Mr Wood. The Executive Council were actuated by no sectional views; their object was to make the whole of the Resolutions, not only palatable, but beneficial to the Colony. The merits of Esquimalt as a site for the Docks, are in themselves a sufficient reason to advance in favor of the Executive opinion being correct. I shall vote for the Clause as it stands.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—I am one of those who think it proper to have the locality for the Docks named; and I think the Government would have made a blunder if they had left out the word "Esquimalt." It would have been wrong in my opinion if the Government had framed the Resolutions with any sectional views. But it appears to me whilst they are likely to do the Colony good generally, they have been framed with a tendency to create the popular vote, and I do not see much harm in that. The point which I want to hear about is, whether £100,000 will be sufficient to construct a good Dock; and what sort of a Dock it is to be? It is possible that a large Stone Dock may not be of so much use as a Patent Slip. I have visited the Floating Docks in the Arsenals of the United States, to take such observations as would serve an unprofessional man. And I confess that if it is to be a Stone Graving Dock in Constance Cove, to admit of one vessel at a time, I am inclined to the opinion that it would not be as good, or as much public utility, as a Patent Slip. I shall support the item, or a larger sum than £100,000. I believe that a Dock, or a Patent Slip, at Esquimalt, will attract ships from Puget Sound. It is a step in the right direction. There is a feeling abroad, that the Colony would have to construct this Dock. This would be a mistake: but to get Canada to endorse the scheme, by giving a guarantee for the interest, is in my opinion the right course to pursue.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—That is the intention; that a private company should undertake the work, the Dominion giving a guarantee. It will be left for the company to choose. Probably Clarke's patent slip, with hydraulic lift, would be the easiest worked as it would be the cheapest. It could probably be erected for £75,000, whereas a cut stone Graving Dock would cost more. One of the advantages of latter would be that there would be more money expended in the Colony during its construction, whereas the principal cost of a patent slip would be expended elsewhere for machinery. I cannot say if £100,000 would be enough for the construction of a cut stone Dock or not. I think that a guarantee of five per cent on £100,000 will be a sufficient inducement for any company to take the matter up. I am convinced that £100,000 will not build a stone Dock of sufficient capacity to take in such a ship as the Zealous.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—If the people of Victoria desire the terms why should not they vote for Union? My desire is, if we are to be united, to see a union which shall be lasting. I say that these terms are not lasting. They are in the nature of direct and immediate pecuniary advantage. Reaction will set in after the Railway and Dock are built. Show me in these terms continuing and abiding benefit and I am satisfied. Let the people of Victoria choose, but I ask Hon. Members, who understand human nature, whether the people would not choose direct benefit in preference to prospective and continuing advantages. Mankind will choose direct present pecuniary benefit, rather than that benefit which is to be lasting and remote. I fear reaction. I look upon this place as my home, and shall complain, I think with justice, if ten years' hence I find a great reaction of the present hasty action.

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—Would it be better to have Confederation with no terms at all, or with terms equal to these?

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I ask for different terms; power to impose our own tariff for instance.

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—The objections of the Hon. Member are not correct. When the Dock and Railway are built, I admit that some source of labour, and consequent interest, will be gone, but then we must look for other interests to arise. I admit that discontent may arise; it has frequently been so in England, when a large number of labourers have been thrown out of employment; but I say that the Dominion and Local Governments will have the power and the sense to remedy any such evils as they occur.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I cannot fancy anything more calculated to promote permanent benefit than the establishment of Graving Docks. Every ship that comes in would spend money, would be a benefit to the town, and a continuing benefit; and not to the town only, but to some extent to the whole Colony. If the Colony goes on and increases, so must the work to be done in the Docks go on increasing. I regret that the Hon. Mr. Wood should have taken the ground that the Executive are influenced by any sectional motives. I do [illegible] why the Hon. Member should refuse benefits which come under Confederation. He would surely not prefer to go in without terms.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—I doubt whether the amount name is large enough. I have information from good authority that double that amount will be re-

quired. Canada is only asked to guarantee the interest. I shall, therefore move an amendment, in the shape of a recommendation to His Excellency, that the sum of £100,000 be increased to £150,000 in the conditions. I am of opinion that the terms should be put in as favourable a light as possible for this Colony.

Hon. Mr. PEMBERTON—I would ask the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works whether it would be possible to connect the supply of water with the Docks. London is supplied by a large fresh water reservoir, and it is possible that the same course might be adopted as regards this city. If the course of the water in the valley of Victoria Arm were stopped, the Gorge being a natural valley, if it were possible to exclude the salt water from the whole of Victoria Harbour, a vast natural reservoir of fresh water might be formed, which would supply the whole city with water. Being no engineer, I feel some diffidence in putting it forward. I only put it as a suggestion to the Chief Commissioner, with the view of inquiring whether it could be done.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—It is impossible for me to offer an opinion upon the suggestion of the Hon. Mr. Pemberton. The supply of water upon the supposed plan, would contemplate the expenditure of much more money than the sum required for Graving Docks besides the proposed place is too low, and would necessitate the water being pumped up to a second Reservoir. Moreover I am of opinion that the supply of water is too much of a local matter to be worthy of mention in the Terms.

Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK—My Amendment is, that the word "Esquimalt" be struck out, on the grounds that it is too sectional. I believe that any Company which is formed will erect a Patent Slip, instead of a Dock. It has been shown in practice to be more useful. I move that the word "Esquimalt" be struck out.

Hon. Mr. Wood's recommendation to strike out the word "Esquimalt," and to insert "such place as the Dominion Government shall appoint," on division was lost, two only voting in favor of it.

Hon. Mr. Drake's recommendation "That the sum of £150,000 be named," on division was lost, eight voting in favor of the recommendation.

Clause 4 was then passed as read.

The Chairman then read Section 5.

"5. In addition to the other provisions of this "Resolution, Canada shall assume and defray the "charges of the following Services:—

"*a.* Salary and allowances of the Lieutenant Gov-"ernor;

"*b.* Salaries and Allowances of the Judges and "Officers of the Supreme Court, and of the County "Courts;

"*c.* The charges in respect of the Department of "Customs;

"*d.* The Postal Department;

"*e.* Lighthouses, Buoys, Beacons, and Lightship, "and such further charges as may be incident to and "connected with the Services which by 'The British "North America Act, 1867,' appertain to the General "Government, and as are or may be allowed to the "other Provinces."

The Hon. the ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the adoption of this Clause, which he said was taken from "The British North America Act, 1867," and would relieve the Colony of the payment of a certain amount annually in the shape of Salaries.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—I shall move a recommendation that the maintenance of the Roads by the Dominion Government, be included in this Clause.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—This seems to be a made up Clause, it is provided for in "The British North America Act," and the insertion of the Clause in these Resolutions looks like setting it before the Country for the object of educating them up to what they are expected to ask for.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—It is an essential part of the whole scheme.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—I think it is partly provided for by "The British North America Act;" yet it is included in the Terms of the proposed admission of Newfoundland.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—And of all the other Provinces.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I do not agree with the Hon. Member for Victoria District. I think the Act of British North America applies to original Provinces, and provision is made for the admission of others. They might be presumed to apply to us, but I think it is proper to ask in an address that these charges should be put in, and that it is as necessary to insert these as it is to insert any clauses. We should make it plain that we desire to have these terms applied to us.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—There is no provision in paragraph *b.* for payment of salaries of Judges of Admiralty or District Courts.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I move to strike out these paragraphs; they are mere verbiage. One word with respect to the Admiralty Court, which ought to be included if the Supreme Court is inserted.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—We have no power, as a Council, to deal with the constitution of the Admiralty Court; nor is this the proper time to enter into any discussion respecting it.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I say we have every power, and I take this opportunity of saying that the Admiralty Court is badly managed. I have heard it insinuated that the Judges of the Admiralty Court in this Colony have been influenced by fees to prolong the business of the Court, and drag out Admiralty business to its utmost length, instead of pushing it through, as the business of the Common Law Courts is pushed through. There ought to be no fees. Admiralty practice in this Colony is likely, in case of war, to assume enormous proportions. I do not see why a condition should not be inserted to provide us with an Admiralty Court with Judges to be paid by fees.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—Does the Hon. the Attorney General intend to insert Admiralty Court?

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—We must not arrogate to ourselves powers which we have not; and the insertion of such a clause in the Resolutions which we are now discussing would be entirely out of place, and I would suggest to Hon. Members not to introduce this Resolution now, but let it be brought up as a substantive measure. It cannot be brought up again if it is decided now.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I said, and I repeat it, that if the Imperial Government were properly approached this thing might be done, just as if the Crown were properly approached, the Crown Salaries Act might be repealed.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—I think some action ought to be taken. I wish to call attention to the fact that the Canadian Parliament have power to fix the salaries of the Judges in Admiralty, where they are paid by salaries.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—Then bring the matter up separately.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—I would draw the Attorney General's attention to section 100 of the British North America Act, which includes Admiralty Courts where the Judges are paid by salaries and pensions. It is expressly stated that the terms of the British North America Act shall apply to this Colony; then why not insert it in the words of the Act, though we are aware that these Resolutions have to be carried, there is no reason that we should not add recommendations. I think section 100 of the Act is better than our clause. I will move the addition of the word "pensions."

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I cannot see that the application of section 100 would meet the case. It would be ineffectual because our Judges of the Admiralty Court are not paid by salaries, therefore it would be inoperative as regards British Columbia. Whilst I deem it quite desirable to make the change suggested, I do not think this is the time to make it. I should suggest postponing the discussion of the question as to Admiralty Court until these Resolutions are settled.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—Why complicate the question? Why not bring it up in open House and discuss it?

Hon. Mr. WOOD—It could be done in three or four months. The Judges of the Admiralty Courts could be put upon salaries, and Section 100. would then be applicable. We are upon the question of Judges, and why not decide it at once.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—I am not prepared to discuss this question, as to the Admiralty Court, now. If proper notice is given of its being brought up, I shall then be prepared to go fully into its merits.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—The principle is bad to pay Judges by fees.

Hon. Mr. RING—The question is: are the Judges of the Admiralty Court Judges? Why should we not say say clearly and unmistakeably what we mean? I shall support the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Wood, and I hope the members of the Government will pause before they oppose it. Let them consider whether it is desirable to admit the principle that any person exercising the office of a Judge should be paid by fees. I say that the question is properly

before us now, and the recommendation comes fairly and correctly in this place.

Hon. Mr. ALSTON—I agree with the Hon. Mr. Wood, as to the constitution of the Admiralty Court, but should vote against the recommendation, and for the Resolution, because I do not think that this recommendation, or amendment, for it virtually amounts to that, if acted upon by the Executive, would effect the cure; the Judges would still take fees.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I shall be obliged to vote against this recommendation, if it is pressed, on account of the way in which it is brought up here. The friends of the alteration are those who are refusing to join in bringing it forward at this inopportune time. A vote taken now, would prevent free discussion of the subject. I recommend the Hon. Member to withdraw his amendment, and I invite full and free discussion of the subject of the Admiralty Courts upon a special day to be fixed.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—This discussion is inapposite at this time. If this side of the House were again the consideration of the payment of Admiralty Judges by fees, they could let it pass in Committee, and kill it in the House; then, under our Standing Orders, it could not be brought up again, but we do not intend to do so. I shall vote against it.

The Hon. Mr. W[illegible] with the permission of the Council, withdre[illegible] amendation, on the understanding that it [illegible] brought up at a future day as a distinct moti[illegible]

The Hon. Mr. Drake's r[illegible]mmendation as to Pensions was put, and lost.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—It is treating the recommendations of non-official members with contempt and disrespect, to find the Government Members voting them down. ["No, no," from the Attorney General.] ["Yes, yes," from Mr. Drake.] Let us have an opportunity of putting our opinions upon record. This Government vote operates as a wet blanket upon all occasions.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—It is the common sense of the House, which says that recommendations which are against the basis of the Resolutions should not pass.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—If what we do is not to meet the eye of the Executive, it is of no use being here. I never felt so mean. Our position in this Council is nugatory; utterly futile and contemptible. If all the elected members felt as I do, we should leave the Council in a body, and have nothing more to do with it. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos.] I find it difficult to speak of the Government conduct of business in this House with patience.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—I should really like to know what this is all about. One Hon. Member says that the course is disrespectful, because the sense of the Council was against him. The Hon. Member for Lillooet indulges in a species of harangue which is peculiar to him, when he is at a loss for an argument, he shakes the red flag of officialdom before him, lowers his head, and charges at it madly. With regard to disrespect, I think we treat them with respect by discussing them here at all. We might allow them to pass here, and vote them down in the Executive; but instead of that, the Executive Members enter freely into the discussion here, and declare what their views are fully. As to voting recommendations of Hon. Members down, when a suggestion is made to substitue one scheme for another, it would be strange if the Government Members should not unite in voting it down. With regard to the recommendations for adding to the terms and conditions, they ought to be carefully made, or their insertion may create great disappointment in the public mind by leading people to expect more than will be acceded. Hon. Members should weigh their votes well. I, for one, will not vote for what I cannot recommend to His Excellency in the Executive Council.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—I am not in the habit of holding my head down, I always hold it up. I agree with the Hon. Mr. Wood, that all that we are likely to do for the public benefit is crushed by the official vote.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—The Hon. Mr. Wood has stated that the recommendations of the Elected Members would be treated with contempt. He is not a Member of the Executive Council. I as a Member of that Council can tell him that they are always treated with the greatest respect.

Hon. Mr. Wood—What I say is that the recommendations of Independent Members do not reach, and will not reach, the head of the Executive. We want them to reach. We all believe that the Members of the Executive will mention them, but that is not what we want. We desire that these recommendations should meet the eye of the Executive. I disdain to consider that the Executive rules this Colony. They do not; they administer the Government, and I consider it to be the duty of the Executive to sink their own views, when they do not accord with the popular will. It is quite possible that the Executive may be wrong and the Popular Members right occasionally.

Hon. Mr. TRUTCH—I do not think the position of the Hon. Mr. Wood is correct. There are now Three Resolutions of, so called, Popular Members before the Executive; why are so many of their recommendations carried if there is any desire to treat them with disrespect? The difficulty is, that the Hon. gentleman persisted in trying to force a vote upon his Resolution about the Admiralty Court. I, if pressed to give an opinion at an inapposite time, would vote against it.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—The conviction in and out of this House is, that the Elected Members are useless, being out-numbered by the official vote. The only reason why I would endeavour to be elected to a seat, in a Council so constituted, is to prevent evils that might happen. The Government might get tools to go in and vote as they liked. The Government might get some one to be elected, and then call it the popular vote. The mistake has been in interpreting recommendations into amendments.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—Mr. Chairman, I think that nothing can be more unfair, nothing more ungenerous, than the position taken by some Hon. Members towards the Government. This scheme was brought down to the House by the Government, and we were invited by the Hon. Attorney General, and other Members of the Government, to make any recommendations or suggestions that we thought proper, and they would receive every consideration at the hands of the Executive. I fail to see one single act or vote at variance with that position. I have seen the leading Members of Government voting different ways; and this I take to be an evidence of their sincerity. There seems to be a disposition to run away with the impression that the unofficial members are treated with disrespect, to me, Sir, such a position is undignified and absurd. Because I have moved a recommendation, and the House has voted it down, am I treated with disrespect. Why! follow this up and an adverse vote would be in every case an insult to the minority, and legislation would become an impossibility. I am grateful to the Government for what I consider a great scheme, grateful for having the opportunity of voting upon it, and I join the Hon. Chief Commissioner in warning the House against voting alterations in the Terms, lest such a course should create hopes to be afterwards disappointed, and lead to a reaction which might result in the defeat of the whole scheme at the polls. I would also caution Hon. Members to avoid attempting to induce the Government to insert terms which would imperil the scheme with the Dominion Government. I shall set aside any particular views and suggestions I should like to make, to avoid that result. I can understand enemies of the cause rushing in resolutions calculated to raise extravagant hopes, and so produce disappointment and fatal reaction, but not friends of the cause. In recommending alterations to Government our reason and judgment should be fairly and calmly exercised.

Clause 5 was put to the Committee by the Chairman, and passed as read.

The Chairman read Clause 6:—

"6. Suitable Pensions, such as shall be approved "of by Her Majesty's Government, shall be provided "by the Government of the Dominion for those of "Her Majesty's Servants in the Colony, whose position and emoluments derived therefrom would be "effected by political changes on the admission of this "Colony into the Dominion of Canada."

The Hon. Attorney General said:—In proposing the adoption of this clause, it is only necessary for me to state to the House that it is inserted in accordance with Lord Granville's despatch. Confederation will, in all probability, affect the positions of certain officials, and the despatch advises that provision should be made, hence this clause.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—I do not approve of the principle of pensions, and I cannot understand why pensions should be given to men who came out to this Colony, as I came out, as needy adventurers. The people of this country do not approve of pensions. If Hon. Members had been induced to come out from England to assume positions under Government for life, I could understand their being provided for with

pensions, on the positions being abolished. I was once a Government Officer in this Colony myself, and should of course have liked to get a pension; but in my opinion the present Government officials have drawn very good pay for doing very little work, for long enough; and before a pension is given, it should be shown that the person to whom it is given has done the State some service.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—We have now, Sir, arrived at the Government's "wisdom" in delaying Confederation in 1868, and subsequently, and of which we heard from the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works. The Hon. gentlemen who own this Colony, for the Governor and Executive virtually own the country, are now ready to execute a quit claim deed of this Colony to Canada, for a pension to each, and it may be the cheapest mode of getting rid of them. Pensions are a modern discovery. The Romans granted triumphal entries as a reward to their most distinguished citizens; and the Greeks crowned those whom they would honor with laurels; but now pensions are the fashion. How much more substantial! The whole secret of the opposition of the Government to Confederation lay in the question of pensions. [No, no]. [Yes, yes]. Still I shall vote for the clause, as I believe this to be the cheapest way of buying out the present possessors, the virtual owners of the Colony. I think it ought to be pensions or compensation, but I will move no amendment.

Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK—I am prepared to support this clause. It shows that Great Britain does not forget her public servants. It is a good and proper clause, and a usual one. This is following out what is done in every other British Colony. I shall support the clause

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I shall support this clause. It stands out in strong contrast to the action of the Imperial Government, in their treatment of public officers upon the occasion of another Union. I am glad to see this clause inserted, as representing a principle that ought always to be recognized.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—The Hon. Member for Victoria District is attributing motives again. If he throws dirt on others, he must expect to have it thrown back on himself, and it might as well be said that Hon. representative members who vote for Confederation, only voted for it for the sake of the loaves and fishes. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos]. This is a question for the Canadian Government, not for us. Government officials are entitled to some compensation for loss of offices, and the Canadian Government will think so too. To them I leave it. They will, I believe, settle the question honourably.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—I challenge any man to say that I ever asked to have any Government post or appointment. I have lived half a century, and three-fourths of that time I have earned my own bread, and spent my own money.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—I don't accuse the Hon. Member of seeking office. I say the argument might be used, and if gentlemen will throw dirt, they must expect to get it thrown on them.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—The remarks I made, were as to times past. As to dirt, I never use it. I deal in facts. I know men, however, who have for themselves and friends stuck closely to the loaves and fishes, and I could name some public men who did their best and succeeded in depriving the Colony of Vancouver Island of half a million of dollars, that the Duke of Newcastle, as Colonial Secretary, said belonged to it. [Hon. Mr. Helmcken—"Name"]. No, I will not mention names. I say, again, that the chief reason for this question not being taken up in 1868, was because pensions were not provided. Now, Sir, I am glad the Hon. senior Member for Victoria City has afforded me an opportunity to explain the part that I took in pressing Confederation on the Council in 1868. I first endeavoured, with the Hon. Member for New Westminster, to enlist Governor Seymour in the matter,—get him to take it up as a Government measure,—and open negotiations with the Canadian Government. But he refused to interfere in it, and said the Council might deal with it. Without the support of the Governor, in a Council so constituted, there was no hope for the measure. It then became a question whether any Resolution on it ought to be brought forward in the Council. Some confederates urged that it would not do to have a Resolution defeated. On the other hand, I thought it best to make some proposition, merely to elicit an expression of the Council's opinion, and show the country its attitude on the question. For in agitating the question, unless it could be proved incontestably that the Council and Executive were opposed, the people could not be aroused to take action. I, therefore, brought it up in a series of Resolutions before the House, and not in Committee of the Whole. If I had had the least hope that it would have passed, I would have had it considered in Committee of the Whole, the proper place to settle such an important matter, after the terms had been settled between the two Governments. As a matter of course, the Resolutions were defeated. But subsequently, when it was urged upon the Governor, at the instance of the Collector of Customs, that the Council be allowed to take action, he said "No. Let the people act."

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—I shall vote in favour of this clause, and I only desire to offer three remarks, the Council have had two objects mainly in view: first, to bring in a scheme which should bring general prosperity; and, secondly, that no vested interests should be affected by the act of Confederation. The positions held by official gentlemen are, I contend, vested interests, and as such, entitled to protection. As regards the way in which members have been treated in other Colonies, there are numbers who are now receiving pensions. I may instance two notable members of the Imperial Government: the Right Hons. Robert Lowe and H. C. E. Childers. I desire to put it upon record that I vote for this clause with as much pleasure as I support any clause of the Resolutions.

Clause 6 was then read by the Chairman, and passed as read.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL proposed the adoption of Clause 7:—

"7. The Dominion Government shall supply an "efficient and regular fortnightly Steam Communica-"tion between Victoria and San Francisco, by Steamers "adapted and giving facilities for the conveyance of "passengers and cargo."

This clause speaks for itself, and it is unnecessary for me to say anything in support of it.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—I regard this paragraph of the Resolutions as a make-weight, nothing more nor less. It is a mistake to make it one of the essential conditions. The time may come when we don't want this steam communication. The Railway may come to Puget Sound, and then this clause will be unnecessary. People will say, at first, that this is a splendid thing. But it is all included in the British North America Act.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—The Hon. Member refers, I suppose, to clause 5. of Section 92, which excepts "Lines of Steam Ships between the Province and any British or Foreign country" from the "Local works and undertakings" which are declared to be subjects of exclusive provincial legislation. The Dominion Government would have to make provision for mail steamers. This clause provides for regular communication. When we have communication with Canada by railway, such a clause as this would be unnecessary, but now, if confederated, we shall need more than ever, regular and more frequent communication with San Francisco, which is the chain of communication with Canada.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—There seems to be a spirit of distrust in this and other clauses of these Resolutions, a desire to have everything in writing. I believe that we should have a steam ship line without this clause.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—The Hon. Member says it is of no use. If the clause was not there, the Dominion Government need not give us this communication. Postal communication it must give, but that means only communication with Olympia.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I do not think that this implies distrust any more than asking a man to give a note for a debt implies distrust. In the conditions framed on the admission into the Confederation of Prince Edward Island and Newfoundland, these matters are set out with great minuteness. I perfectly agree that we might trust the Canadian Government, but we are not in Canada, and we are asked to name specific terms. Surely we ought to do so. It would be very unbusiness-like to say to the Dominion, we will leave it all to you. The Dominion Government would say let it be prepared in black and white, so that we may say whether we can perform it or not.

The Chairman read Clause 7. Passed as read.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL proposed the adoption of Clause 8:—

"8. Inasmuch as no real Union can subsist between "this Colony and Canada without the speedy estab-"lishment of communication across the Rocky "Mountains by Coach Road and Railway, the Do-

"minion shall within three years from the date of "Union, construct and open for traffic such Coach "Road, from some point on the line of the Main "Trunk Road of this Colony to Fort Garry, of similar "character to the said Main Trunk Road; and shall "further engage to use all means in her power to "complete such Railway communication at the earli-"est practicable date, and that Surveys to determine "the proper line for such Railway shall be at once "commenced; and that a sum of not less than One "Million Dollars shall be expended in every year, "from and after three years from the date of Union, "in actually constructing the initial sections of such "Railway from the Seaboard of British Columbia, to "connect with the Railway system of Canada."

I move this Resolution, Mr. Chairman, as being the practical bond of Union between the Dominion and this Colony. I leave it to other members to discuss the details. I merely say that three years is the time deemed necessary to make preliminary surveys, and the expenditure of a sum of $1,000,000 is the best practical guarantee that the work will be done. The Dominion would not submit to the expenditure of such an amount if they did not intend to push the work forward as quickly as possible.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—Sir, I do not claim any honour in connection with the Resolution respecting the Railway. I am perfectly willing to accord the praise that is due to the originator of this clause, but think a portion of it a great mistake. I do not altogether like the way in which these Resolutions are got up. I don't like the preamble as to "real union." In all these Government Resolutions there is something of a "catching" character; little hooks to catch the popular vote. Material union can exist without railroads. Look at the real union between this Colony and Great Britain. People who were here in 1859 may recollect how safe they felt during the San Juan difficulty, and subsequently during the Trent affair. There was then a physical union: we felt that we should be protected by force if necessary. I believe that I was amongst the first or second of those who moved in the matter of the transcontinental coach road. But whilst on this subject I will take occasion to do justice to the memory of the gentleman who proposed the Overland Railway through British America. It was during the administration of Sir Robert Peel, in 1844 or 1845, that A. W. Godfrey, a bookseller in Halifax, addressed letters to Sir Robert Peel, about a Railway from Halifax to Vancouver Island. Previously, Whitney had proposed his scheme for a Railroad from Texas to the Pacific. Our worthy old citizen, Mr. Waddington, has been distinguished among those who have taken active measures in favor of the Railway. Till Lord Granville's despatch arrived, none of the railway agitators seemed to have made much headway. At the Conference of Delegates from British North America in London, an Overland Railway was considered and described as "a subject "of the highest importance, and one to be promoted "at the earliest stage that the finances of the country "would admit of." The proposition before us shows how great a stride has been made in this matter since 1867. I have no wish to claim any honour or to detract from that which is due to others, but we must recollect that $1,000,000 a year is not a Railway across the Rocky Mountains. I have, however, year after year looked upon Railway communication as the only means to settle up the interior of British Columbia. I never could see how British Columbia could be settled up without a Railway to connect Fraser River with Kamloops. I think, Sir, that a different course ought to be pursued by the Government with the Dominion than that proposed. Assuming that the Coach Road may be open in three years, for I am ready to admit that proposition, when people settle the country from Thompson River to Osoyoos Lake the farmers must have the means of transport for their various productions. How are they to get them out? I maintain that the true course for the development of the resources of the country is to make a line of Railway from some navigable spot on the Fraser to Lake Kamloops. I claim for this that it might be regarded as a part of the transcontinental line, and in my opinion it would do more to build up the country than anything else that could be conceived, and I believe it to be thoroughly practicable. I, therefore, move a recommendation to His Excellency that the construction of a Railway from steamboat navigation on the Fraser River to Kamloops Lake be inserted in the terms, instead of commencing from the initial sections on the Seaboard of British Columbia.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Sir, I approach the consideration of this clause with a great sense of the magnitude of the work which we propose to the Government of that Dominion with which we propose to be confederated. My mind seems somewhat to shrink before the contemplation of its magnitude; and it is only when the reflection is gradually forced upon me, that the union can never be a reality until the Railway is commenced in our own territory, and that it is necessary, that I can bring myself to believe that it should be done. That it is practicable is undeniable and needs no argument. From all information I have been able to obtain, and comparing it with the difficulties which have been overcome on the Pacific line, I believe the proportion of cost of the proposed line of Railway fro[illegible] Columbia to Canada to be not more than two-thirds of the cost of the line already built from California across the Sierra Nevada. There will of course be difficulties to overcome, which may influence the choice of the best line of route. I believe we are justified in asking for the construction of the Railway, and I am satisfied. I may say I know, that there is a great desire on the part of those now in power in Canada to construct this Railroad, and if it be in their power to do it, it will be done. To go to the terms: objections have been made to the time of commencement. I would ask the House to consider what an amount of prospecting and survey will have to be done before any commencement can possibly be made in the work. I do not think that there is any delay suggested by fixing the time of three years. I think it is the shortest time that could be named. The proper line could hardly be determined sooner. We do not presume to suggest the scheme, or the means. My opinion is that the Railway will be built by private enterprise, under a guarantee. As the Imperial Government have shown a desire to encourage Confederation, I think we have a right to expect that they will render some assistance in the building of the Railway, especially after Lord Granville's despatch [Hear, hear.] I hope that the Canadian Government will have the assistance of the Imperial Government in carrying out this scheme. It will be some time before the scheme can be developed, and then at least two seasons must elapse, as an immense amount of reconnoitering and surveying will be necessary. Three years is not too much. The Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) objects to the framing of this Resolution as too catching. I think his objection is unfounded. I believe that the benefits will be real and substantial. The reason that so small a sum as $1,000,000 is asked for is that it is only intended to be an earnest, so to speak, on the part of the Dominion Government that the Railway will be made. I believe that the expenditure of $1,000,000 upon the first twenty miles will bring an accession of from 5,000 to 10,000 to our population. We have a right to ask that the Railway should be commenced here. It is desirable that it should be made here. It will be found that when once it is commenced here a nucleus of population will be formed which will add considerably to the prosperity of the Colony. It has been argued that no profit can arise from the expenditure of the vast amount of capital that will be required to build this Railway. It will cost probably $20,000,000, and therefore is not likely to be profitable for years to come. We cannot, in my opinion, expect any pecuniary return for years. It behoves the Dominion Government, if they desire the prosperity of this part of the empire, to develop the resources of the estate which we are handing over. If they value it as we do, and as we believe that they do, they will endeavour to realize the advantages at the earliest possible date. This Railway will do so, when it is completed across the Rocky Mountains, and in my opinion not till then we shall have a population. Before concluding, I desire to say that it is intended, although it is not so stated in the terms, to give an assurance to the Dominion Government that any amount of land which they think reasonable will be given. This will be made a part of the scheme for the construction of the Railway if thought desirable.

Hon. Mr. HUMPHREYS—Sir, I look upon this clause as most important. I am one of those who believe that there can be no real Confederation without a Railroad. Government has made a mistake in naming the sum of $1,000,000 to be expended on the Seaboard. There is no necessity to put this in. This would only bring a floating population, which we do not want. I agree with the Hon. Member for Victoria District that the Railway ought to be commenced in the agricultural districts of the Mainland, so as to

connect them with the head of navigation on the Fraser.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—It does not become us, I think, to dictate in what way the work should be done, or to describe the details of the scheme to Canada. I feel confident that if this plan is really taken up it will be done much more quickly than if only $1,000,000 a year were spent. I think that several millions a year will be expended, and if so I have little doubt that the Railway from the Seaboard to the agricultural districts will be made in 5 years.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—What is the Seaboard? Does it mean Barclay Sound?

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—That is what we have purposely left open. The line may come down the valley of the Fraser, as in my opinion will be best, or it may come through to Bute Inlet or Bentinck Arm. We have purposely generalized and left it for those who undertake the work to determine for themselves. It is not desirable for us to cramp this Resolution by defining the locality for the line or terminus.

The Hon. Mr. ROBSON—Sir, I conceive that we have now come to the most vital part of the whole scheme. I quite concur in the opinion that no real union can take place without a Railway. Did I believe that the Overland Railway would not be made, should hesitate very much about Confederation, because I should be apprehensive that the whole scheme would fall to pieces. I think that great haste must be used to build up an English speaking nation, alongside of an other existing English speaking country. To accomplish this end, I think that the Overland Railway is necessary, and must be pushed through to speedy completion, to be an immediate success. In ten years time, without an Overland Railway, I do not believe that we should have any English Territory here at all. The great work must be undertaken with the assistance of both the Canadian and Imperial Governments, and pushed through to a speedy success. It is true that a sort of union might exist without a Railway, such as the union between British Columbia and Great Britain. But we propose to establish a union that will endure, and that will render an Overland Railway just as necessary as the veins in the human body are necessary to circulate the blood and to keep up life. I believe that $1,000,000 is a mere nominal sum, as explained by the Hon. Chief Commissioner, a tangible security that the work will be completed. The expenditure of the first Million will be a guarantee that any Company or Government undertaking it will carry it through. Every reflecting mind will see that if any Company spend $1,000,000 a year, they must spend more, and that it will be their interest to push it through. To say that because we only name a sum of $1,000,000, that it will be a matter of 100 years is absurd; my reply to this, I cannot call it an argument, is that capitalists could not be found in the world so silly as to spread the construction over one hundred, or fifty, or twenty, or even ten years. I cannot support the amendment of the Hon. Member for Victoria District, we must carefully avoid committing ourselves to the route or terms of building. I think this may be safely left in the hands of the Dominion Government. It is useless to argue that it is of vital importance to them to have the best route. The Railway must pass through the Colony, and benefit the Colony, no matter where the terminus, it must be in British Columbia, and consequently a benefit to the whole Colony. I cannot see that it would be better to begin in the middle, I look upon it as an absolute necessity that the Railway should commence at the seaboard; moving the material is the great expense that has to be contended against, and the advantage of being able to land the material and lay it down at once on the road, will be incalculable. If the Railway were to be constructed from a given point ten miles from the seaboard, it would probably pay the contractors to build that piece of the line. Unless Hon. Members can show us that the material can be brought to the line by way of the Rocky Mountains, don't let us stultify ourseves by asking them to begin in the middle. It is right that the work should be commenced simultaneously on the Atlantic and Pacific sides. I fancy that, as a matter of policy and economy, any company undertaking the work would so commence, without its being named in the terms, as it would undoubtedly be more economical to carry on the work by sea form the westward in British Columbia, and by land from the East. As for the amount named in the conditions, as I have said, I look upon it as a tangible assurance to the people that the thing will be done, rather than as the specific statement of a sum with the expenditure of which this Colony will be satisfied. I have some doubts about the clause requiring the Dominion Government to make a Coach Road. The age for Coach Roads has almost passed away. Such a road would not meet the requirements of the present day. I would prefer removing this condition, and require the work to be commenced within two years, or seek compensation in some other way as an equivalent for the supposed advantage of the road. The sooner we do our little part towards convincing the Dominion Government that this is necessary, the better. Not only is the Railway a national necessity for the Dominion, but for every fractional part of British North America.

The Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—I reiterate that Confederation means terms. What feeling now exists in favor of Confederation, has been brought about by the assertion that Canada will do certain things for the Colony, amongst others, that she will build a Railway. If the people are deceived in this matter; if Canada does not accede to this portion of the conditions, she need not ask the people of this Colony to be united. I would ask the people to band themselves together to demand that these terms shall be verified, and I hope they will take that stand. And I will ask that the promises made by the Dominion Government will be strictly performed. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos and Mr. Wood.] This Colony would be just as much isolated as ever after a paper union, without a Railway as one of the conditions. I acknowledge that we might have such a union as exists with England now, with a Railway. We are a Colony of England, and I don't know that many people object to being a Colony of England; but I say that very many would object to becoming a Colony of Canada. As a Colony of England we have the right to legislate for ourselves, if we become a Colony of Canada, that power is taken away. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos.] [Hon. Mr. Robson, it will give us more power.] I say that the power of regulating our own commerce is taken away, and the only power left to us is that of raising taxes for Municipal purposes. That is the difference between being a Colony of Canada, and a Colony of England. The distance is so great between this Colony and Ottawa without any Railway and without any Telegraphic communication, that laws might be passed there, which would ruin British Columbia, without our having any notice of them. I do not consider that Canada expects or intends to attempt to make this Railway a paying institution of itself. There are a great many institutions in this Colony, which are not paying institutions. Canada takes the view that the Railway is necessary to complete the British line of communication between England and her Asiatic possessions, in order that the English people may share in the carrying trade to China and the East Indies, with our American neighbours. Canada expects to influence Great Britain to guarantee the loan for the formation of the Railway. Great Britain may guarantee the loan for the purpose of having a check on the American line of Railway, but she would never guarantee it for Canadian purposes only. The people of England would not tolerate it. I consider this an essential condition. Without it Confederation must not take place. This is one of those things which will be a vast benefit to this Colony and to Canada, and therefore I regard it as a necessary condition. Why should this Colony join Canada except for the benefit of both? We should be better off without Canada if we have no Railway. I say that this Colony had better stand alone than risk everything, without a Railway. What benefit can Canada expect from Confederation with British Columbia without a Railway? Is she afraid of British Columbia being handed over to America? If Canada thinks she can hold Canada for her own purposes, and use it when she pleases, and take her own time to do what she likes with it, she is mistaken. The Railway has been made a lever for Confederation, by Canada. I ask that Canada be now made to promise faithfully that a Railway shall be made. With regard to the expenditure of $1,000,000, there should be a forfeit of ten per cent. payable to this Colony, if it is not spent. I am not so much afraid about the Canadian Government not carrying out the terms, as I am of our own people. I believe that there is more danger from our own people than from the Canadian Government. British Columbia may cheat herself, and it is our duty, man for man, to take care that we don't cheat this Colony, that we don't in fact cheat ourseleves. I think that the Coach Road may be useful, it will take some time to build a Railroad, and it will be necessary to have communication. The

road might be used for Immigration purposes, and for driving cattle, but will be of no use commercially; such an idea would have suited people who lived some years ago. Speaking of Commerce in which the Dominion is to take part, I do not myself believe that the Asiatic traffic will come this way; but still we must not lose sight of the idea that it may eventually be partially diverted to this route. These Resolutions do not afford practically any immediate benefit. ["Hear, hear," from Mr. DeCosmos.] If the Colony was united to the Dominion to-morrow, there would be no immediate benefit to result even from the Railway. This is one of the points on which the people may be deceived, if they imagine that with Confederation will come immediate prosperity. I shall be glad if anyone will point out how it is to come. If it were made inland it might be more beneficial to agricultural interests in a short space of time, than if commenced on the sea coast. Public works in this Colony should help to develop the resources, and one thing should be made to work with another, so as to be mutually beneficial, each should be for the benefit of the whole, and the whole for the benefit of each. Suppose a Railway were commenced to-morrow at Fraser River. How much benefit would it be? It might be some, but if these public works were made subservient to the interests of settling up the Colony, they would be more likely to be beneficial.

Hon. Mr. CARRALL—Sir, I have only a few words to say, and have no intention of detaining the House at this late hour, but I must be allowed to express the satisfaction which I feel in observing a change in the sentiments of the Hon. Member for Victoria City, (Mr. Helmcken,) a change which which does honour to his head and heart. He has begun to show some faith in the Canadian Government at last. He may be called the pattern of the distrustful party, and I augur favourably from his conversion. With regard to the local advantages of a Railway, I would point to the construction of the Inter-Colonial Railway. Property in Halifax has gone up 40 per cent since it was built. I fully admit the desirability and necessity of a Railway, but I cannot admit that Union cannot exist without it: look at the Union which existed for so many years between California and the Eastern States of America without a Railway. I believe that Canada, for Imperial reasons, intends to undertake the construction of this Railway. As for the length of time allowed for the commencement, I think it could not be well less than three years. I believe with the Hon. Chief Commissioner, that the work will be undertaken by a private company, under guarantee, if so, it would be hampering the Government of the Dominion to make them commence earlier. It might compel them to close with parties, not in all respects eligible. It would put them in a false position. If the Colony had charge of her own Crown lands, there should be a power given to Canada to promise Crown lands, in connection with the construction of the Railway. I regret that this has not been put in the Resolutions, but no doubt the omission can be remedied hereafter.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Drake, the Committee rose, reported the passing of clauses 5, 6, and 7, and obtained leave to sit again at one o'clock, the 17th, instant.

Report adopted, and clauses 5, 6, and 7, passed.

---

THURSDAY, 17TH MARCH, 1870.

Hon. Mr. DeCosmos—Mr. Chairman, Judging from the statements made by the Government, this Railway is not likely to be completed in so short a period as I had hoped. The indefinite nature of the clause is unsatisfactory. It contemplates nothing more than the expenditure of $1,000,000 per annum, which would no doubt be a great boon, and would stimulate various branches of industry, but that is almost all that can be said of it. The way that it has been put to the Colony heretofore, was that the Canadian Government would construct the road. It now turns out from the statements of the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, that in all probability the Canadian Government will get some private company to carry out the work: and he adds "that we may" get a guarantee with grants of land, in aid of the undertaking. Now, Sir, from the first I have always been careful not to bring forward the question of the Railway in connection with Confederation. The London Conference favoured it only when the financial position of the Dominion admitted it. It must be quite a long time before connection by rail with the Canadian Railway system can take place. I never believed the Canadian Government would contract a debt for this purpose at the present. They are already, in my opinion, too deeply in debt and are taxed too high to allow them to do so. According to my calculation, it will cost $150,000,000 to complete the Railway from this Colony to Montreal.

Hon Mr. HOLBROOK—You mean to the head of the water communication of Lake Superior?

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—No! that gets frozen up and cannot be utilised for several months in the year. It must go to Montreal, on the north side of Lakes Superior and Huron, It will cost $100,000,000 to construct it to Lake Superior from Victoria. Now a 4 per cent guarantee on $100,000,000 will require Canada to impose additional taxation of 4,000,000 a year. Then you must remember that the wear and tear of the Railway would not be met by the returns. Besides that, there are the running expenses to be provided for. The United Rtates trans-continental Railway only pays from the way stations in the populous districts through which it passes; we should have none, except a few people at the Red River and in British Columbia. A 4 per cent guarantee would be adding one third to the annual taxation of the Dominion. Then for the portion of Railway they will have to make from the West end of Lake Superior to Montreal, there would be required $50,000 more at four per cent. To meet these sums, therefore, there would have to be raised an annual sum of $6,000,000 by Canada, in other words they would have to add nearly fifty per cent. to the present taxation of Canada. Do you think, Sir, they will ever do this? or that any Finance Minister would dare attempt it in the present state of Canadian finances. I call attention to this view of the subject in order to prevent false impressions getting abroad, and the creation of false hopes which will only lead to disappointment. With all due deference to his professional knowledge, I deny the correctness of the estimate of the Chief Commissioner that this Railway will cost only two-thirds of the United States Trans-continental line. This is a more difficult line in my opinion, not an easier one, than the line over the Sierra Nevada. Perhaps part of the year we might get communication, partly by steamboat and partly by Railway, but for several months in the winter the water portion of the route would be closed up. In the temper of this House and the temper of the Government, I do not expect this Resolution of mine to go up to the Government. Now, I want to utilise our money, and to utilise our time. I estimate that a Railway from Fraser River to Kamloops would cost $50,000 a mile. According to the plan of the Chief Commissioner, with the expenditure of only $1,000,000 a year, at the end of five years, if we started at Burrard Inlet, we should get to Yale only, for which the water communication at present existing would suffice, and consequently that time would be lost. Possibly, it might be opened to the Rocky Mountains in ten years, if begun at New Westminster as this scheme proposes. It is our duty to open up the interior country—Osoyoos, Okanagan, Kamloops, Similkameen, and other districts. Bring the interior into communication with the Seaboard, that would settle up the best portion of the interior, provide an outlet for produce, and keep the money that is now sent abroad, within our own borders. The Government plan will injure, if not delay, the development of the country. I have no hope that my recommendation will pass, but still I shall have the satisfaction of feeling that I have done my duty.

Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK—Sir, I rise to support the recommendation of the Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos.) I quite agree with that Hon. gentleman that a Railway starting from the head of Steam-boat navigation, would be more useful than any other. If we have a Company spending $1,000,000 a year in building a Railway which will open up the farming districts, we shall be able to raise cereals and compete with our American neighbours, and by commencing at the head of navigation we shall reap the advantage in our lifetime. It will develope the Mainland. Agricultural land would be turned into profitable use, and the Mining section from Big Bend to Kootenay, which contains I believe, most valuable mines of gold and silver, will be opened up. If the recommendation of the Hon. Member is adopted, we shall find almost immediate benefit from the opening up of the Inland Trade. It will bring us population, and will build up this City and New Westminster, and other towns throughout the Colony. I do hope it will receive the support of the Executive Council.

Hon. Mr. RING—Sir, I thought we were discussing the necessity of a Railway, but I did not come prepared to discuss engineering questions as to route, it is wasting words to discuss the topography. That must be decided by competent surveyors. Our business, as it appears to me, is to insist upon having a through Railway. And it is highly desirable that the construction should be commenced simultaneously at both ends as well as the survey. I shall thoroughly and cordially support the Government upon this clause.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Sir, I thought that I had made the Government views on this clause sufficiently clear yesterday, in supporting the Hon. the Attorney General's motion; if not, my words could not have thoroughly expressed my meaning. The Government have not inserted the construction of a Railway into these resolutions on the principle of local advantages. The Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos,) seems to argue that we inserted it in order to secure the advantages which would accrue to special localities from way traffic. But I can assure the House that the Executive Council entertained no such idea in adjusting the details of this great scheme; they have endeavoured to secure the utmost advantages to the whole Colony. You will observe, Sir, that the clause is most general in its terms, and it was purposely made so. It does not attempt to define the line the road should take; it may have a terminus, as I distinctly stated before, at any place on the coast most convenient—at Bentinck Arm, Bute Inlet, or Burrard Inlet, or even by crossing the Fiords between Vancouver Island and the Mainland, it may come to Victoria or Esquimalt. These details must be left to the parties constructing the line. The Executive Council have avoided all through all sectional and local considerations. I stated yesterday, and I repeat it again, that I hoped the Railway would follow down the valley of the Fraser River to the seaboard; but the Government have purposely avoided any definition of any particular line, and have made it as general as possible. I also said that I did not think that the Dominion Government would make the line; and I said so because I am well aware that this is not the way in which great works of this character are generally undertaken in these times. I believe that a private company with the assistance of the Dominion Government, and I hope the Imperial Government also, will construct the line. But this is merely surmise. I know no more of my own actual knowledge than other Members round this board. But I come to this conclusion because I know that it is not considered feasible for Governments to undertake such works. It has been found to be a great mistake. Then why discuss the suggestions of the Hon. Member for constructing a Railway from Yale to Kamloops, or try to fix details which the spirit of the whole resolution avoids, when we don't even say the line shall pass Yale or Kamloops at all? It is a vast undertaking, and if undertaken at all, it will not be with a view to profit, but with a view to the future, and as part of the great responsibility of the Canadian Government in contracting alliance with this Country. The strenuous desire of the Canadian Government is to make such a line. I think they are able to do it, and we know for certain that they will do it if they can. I do not agree with the Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken,) that Confederation means a Railway; the Government do not say that there shall be no Confederation without a Railway.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—No that is my opinion, and I do not put it forward as the opinion of the Government

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I am glad to have that set right. The Government believe that the Railway will be made, but they do not make it a *sine qua non*, but if on a calm view of the whole subject in negotiating with Canada, it is found impracticable for Canada to commence to make the Railway at once, then I see alternative terms, which will not only suit Canada but the people of this Colony, who you must remember will have to pass upon them when they come back from Canada. It has been stated the public mind is impressed with the idea that the insertion of so paltry a sum as $1,000,000, will lead to the postponement of the completion of the Railway for fifty years. I can assure them it is a fallacy. Why, Sir, as well put by the Hon. Member for New Westminster yesterday, common sense shows that it would be against the interest of the parties making the line to prolong the work over a number of years. It can only be carried on quickly to secure any real profit. I again repeat what the Government Members stated yesterday, so distinctly, that the One Million a year is not nearly the sum which will have to be spent; the amount stated is only intended to serve as a guarantee or an earnest that the work will be done. If we had said make it in so many years time, they could not have acceded to it. Certainly in three years time the Dominion Government will be in a position to determine the line. The suggestion of the Hon. Member is, in my opinion, wholly inapplicable to this scheme. If admitted it would entirely remodel the Government clause, which is general. The suggestion is, that the first section should be made at some place on Fraser River. As I said before, we cannot tell whether the Railway will come down the valley of the Fraser River at all. Those who spend the money have a right to choose their line. As far as my own opinion goes, I should say that the Canadian Government will determine the basis of the scheme on engineering considerations of the port best suited for pouring in supplies, and for the cheapest construction of the road. Do not let us hamper so great a scheme by such minute details; let us leave it for those who have to construct the line to select their own route.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—The Hon. the Chief Commissioner has left very little for me to say upon this clause, but there is one point to which I would direct attention. The Hon. Member for Victoria District has not sufficiently considered, it seems to me, how the material for the construction of the Railway would be most easily moved to the line from the sea coast. If the road is to be commenced at Yale, all the vast material and rolling stock would have to be shipped from the port in small steamers up the Fraser River, to a point at which the line, according to the Hon. Member's scheme, would start. The extra expense would be ruinous, and besides it must be remembered that during a considerable portion of the year the navigation of the river is closed to steamers, and not only is this the case, but these boats cannot take up the engines and cars, but can only carry on the ordinary traffic when the population increases. No, the real, the only proper course will be to commence to lay the track from the ships to where the material will have to be laid. That alone puts out of the question the commencement of any initial section at Yale, or anywhere else than on the sea-board.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—Mr. Chairman, I am glad to hear from Hon. Members that this clause is the pivot of the whole scheme. I hope it will now be well understood that the Railway is *the* condition in Hon. Members' minds upon which Confederation or no Confederation hangs. I hope that this will be remembered hereafter. This Railway is a gigantic undertaking. I look upon it as nearly impracticable. I believe this Railway will cost more than the whole debt of Canada. ["Hear, hear," from Hons. DeCosmos and Robson.] The Government tells us that this Railway is to be a *sine qua non*. ["No," Dr. Helmcken.] Why my colleague, the Hon. Member for Victoria, who is a Privy Councillor, says no.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—The Government does not say so, I say so.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—Well certain Hon. Members say so. Now this is what will happen: Canada will agree to a Railway to get Confederation, and Confederation takes place, Canadian officials rule here and Canadian laws prevail. Three years elapse and Canada may find it inconvenient or impossible to carry out the Railway. I say that we require a guarantee for the making of the Railway. On Confederation how can we inforce this condition. This difficulty underlies the whole scheme. I ask how we are to get out of it, guard against it, or surmount it? Leave the Confederation? That means rebellion, which is not to be thought of by any law-loving persons. We can't float ourselves out when once in, then we are bound hand and foot from now to eternity. There should be a a penalty of $50,000 for every year in which Canada fails to expend the One Million.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—How do you propose to secure the $50,000?

Hon Mr. DRAKE—By Imperial guarantee.

An Hon. MEMBER—How would the guarantee of the President of the United States do? [Laughter.[

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—I shall be quite satisfied if the President of the United States indorses the Bill [laughter.] I consider the Railway the primary and essential condition of Confederation and I think that Canada is too poor to guarantee such a work as this. She had to go to the Imperial Government to guarantee the payment of the £300,000 to buy out Canadian interests in the Red River Settlements, and I maintain that we are on the right course to ask for

an Imperial guarantee now. When we get into Confederation we cannot help ourselves. If Canada is unable or unwilling to pay the $1,000,000 a year, as soon as it appears necessary to her to throw over the conditions, over they will be thrown. One Hon. Member tells us that Canadian statesmen are "men of unbounded ambition." Now men of unbounded ambition will not scruple at anything to gain their ends; that is all they look to. Until a guarantee is obtained i shall oppose this Resolution. I don't care whether it is the guarantee of the President of the United States or any other that will do.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I have listened with profound astonishment to the remarks of the Hon. Member who has just sat down, upon Canada and Canadian statesmen. I shall not condescend to reply to the aspersions. Canada can support herself against all this kind of thing. She is great enough to do so. Such attacks can only come from those who know nothing about those whom they malign. I am a Canadian, and am proud of being one, but in this matter of making terms of union, I shall be as exacting as any reasonable Member of this Council can be. I would have all the conditions well understood, and would have them put in black and white, but I would ask no endorsement from any other source. When this agreement is completed between British Columbia and Canada we shall have the best possible of guarantees. We shall have the guarantee of the Imperial Government, and of Her Majesty the Queen, from first to last. We shall have the endorsement of the Queen's Proclamation, which lies at the root of these conditions. Can we have or desire better security? [Hear, hear, from Mr. Trutch.] Hon. Members say we cannot get out, and that Canada may repudiate. I say nothing of the kind. Canada would never be allowed by the Imperial Government to coerce this Colony to remain in Confederation for the fulfilment of one side of a contract of partnership, the terms of which Canada herself has trodden underfoot. To entertain such a supposition is, if I may be allowed the expression, an outrage on common sense too absurd to be for a moment seriously entertained. Would the Imperial Government stand by and let Canada send a force of soldiers to compel British Columbia to remain in Confederation under such circumstances. The Canadian Government never broke faith yet, and the Imperial Government never broke faith yet, and both are pledged to the fulfilment of this condition. Canada has hitherto gone in advance of her word. The distrustful views of the Hon. junior Member for Victoria (Mr. Drake) are so manifestly unjust that, as it is impossible that they can arise from ignorance, I may be pardoned for attributing them to wilfulness, to a rabid sense of opposition, and a chronic feeling of distrust. To ask the President of the United States to endorse a scheme which emanates from the Imperial Government I look upon as a monstrous ill-timed joke, against which reason and argument are powerless. I cannot—we cannot—discuss it. Now, to go to the ways and means. Why, Sir, it is well known that Canada is rich. Does the Hon. Member know that Ontario and Quebec have $4,000,000 lying idle at this moment, carrying low interest. There is plenty of capital in Canada at this moment to build the Pacific Railway. The reason why Canada uses the Imperial guarantee for the £300,000 is this. She can borrow cheaper through the Imperial Government with their guarantee, than without it. Canada frequently borrows money for public works. It pays her to do so. It is simply a beneficial financial operation.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—I rise for the purpose of explaining that I make no reflections upon Canadian statesmen, but I treat this solely as a matter of business, and as in other ordinary business I prefer having an endorsed note to a simple obligation. In the 145th section of the British North America Act, an Imperial guarantee for a loan of three millions sterling for a Railway is specified. I think we are justified in making a similar request. Mine is a business condition. I am willing to trust Canada, but I say we are entitled to ask for an endorser. The Hon. Member's remarks have not disturbed my position.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I am obliged, Sir, in the few remarks that I intend to offer to treat of all the amendments and suggestions together. To my mind this condition which requires the construction of the Overland Railway is one of the most important of all the terms. A great deal has been said about the incorruptibility of Canadian statesmen. No doubt Canadian statesmen are very like all others. Canada acts through her ministers. Those now in power are, so far as we know, favourable to this scheme. But, without imputing motives, it must be admitted that it is very possible that a Canadian Ministry some three or four years hence, possibly of the anti-Confederate party, or cold upon the subject of Confederation, when pressed by circumstances, may be disinclined to carry out the terms, and with perfect consistency of political conduct, desire to obtain relief from carrying them out, and their first effort would be to get a vote of the Provincial Legislature to relieve them from the burthen. In the event of Confederation, I should consider this country a Colony of Canada. [Hon. Mr. DeCosmos—"No, an integral part of it."] I say a Canadian Colony, because, as I believe, neither Responsible Government nor full Representative Institutions are to be granted under Confederation; at all events they are not included in these terms. And under such a constitution as we have now, the Canadian Government could easily get a vote of this Legislature to cancel the terms. I repudiate chronic opposition, but I consider it to be my duty to oppose the course that is being taken by some Hon. Members here. I believe there are some Hon. Members of this House who desire Confederation on any or without any terms. ["Name, name," from Hons. Carrall and Robson; "No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos.] The very gentlemen who speak, if I may judge from their votes. [No, no.] If I was in favour of Confederation at all, if I did not think that reaction would follow, if I thought that Lord Granville's argument was sound, I should say "Let us be confederated at once." This brings me to a difference of opinion that exists. Some of us consider the Railway a necessary point in the terms. Many of us, including Lord Granville, consider it essential. The Hon. Chief Commissioner says it is not essential.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I never said the Railway was not essential.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I understood the Hon. Member to say that Government did not consider it essential. I fear that it is delusive to hope that the Imperial Government would give a guarantee for this Railway. They could only do so on Military grounds; but I am convinced they would never guarantee three thousand miles of an exposed line of Railway within a few miles of the territorial boundary, a thing which courts assault and would be so perilous to maintain. Seeing that it could be cut in two in a hundred places by hostile forces from the United States, it requires little reflection to see that Colonial undertakings are seldom guaranteed now. Canada's interest in the Railway, on the other hand, is purely commercial. For such a Railway to pay, it must pass through populous districts—places like Omaha and the United States' towns. It is monstrous to suppose that England would supply the capital for such a scheme. No capitalists in the world would advance their money for such an undertaking. The matter has been talked threadbare in the public prints. It is out of the question to suppose that there would be any material trade in bulky goods this way. [Hear, hear, hear, hear.] Canada, finding the thing difficult, will refuse the terms. ["No, no," from Dr. Carrall.] I say the money will not be spent. I back my knowledge of the world and experience of men and things against the "No, no" of the Hon. Member, and I believe the result will be that the Canadian Government will refuse this item, and in refusing will say "We do the best we can; it is our interest to do the thing, but it is impossible to get the guarantee through Parliament." I believe the Canadian statesmen who have the conduct of this matter will say to our Delegates, or to His Excellency "Don't you think you can do without this Railway; you must take our desire to do it for the deed itself. Bye and bye, perhaps, it can be accomplished, and by no means so effectually as by becoming a part of our Dominion." And so a quiet go by will be given to the Railway, and the terms will come back again shorn of this item. If, as the Hon. Chief Commissioner says, these terms are to come before the people—mind I say the people alone,—I believe there is a feeling that Confederation is a movement which promises something, and this feeling will lead to these terms being passed. So weak are commercial and agricultural interests in this Colony at the present time, so small is the population, and the mass of the people are doing so badly, and are so dissatisfied that, in my opinion, they will vote for anything that will give change and a chance of bettering themselves. I intend, Sir, to move an amendment, with the view of making this Railway a test question:—"That without a substantial guarantee for an Overland Railway, Confederation should be

rejected by the Delegates from this Colony." It is obvious that this motion will be defeated, but I am desirous to test the opinions of the representative members of this Council on so material a point as this The Hon. Chief Commissioner says: that these terms are to be decided, eventually, by the representative members alone, of course without the official vote. And here I may ask, are the official members, in the event of its ultimate discussion, to retire from the Council, and leave the question to the representative members alone? If we are fit for Representative Institutions, why not give them to us now? Having promised the Colony terms, I think the Executive are bound to present terms which are good, in the sense of being productive of permanent good and quiet enjoyment. I cannot forbear to say that in place of terms simply providing for pecuniary benefit, I should have preferred to have seen inserted Constitutional powers, and power of self-government. ["Hear, hear," from Hons. DeCosmos, Robson, and Humphreys]. I should have desired to embody these in the conditions; and, in particular, I should have desired to retain full power over the Tariff.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—The Tariff is left an open question.

Hon. MR. WOOD—Give us reasonable powers of self-government, and I will accept Confederation to-morrow. If we cannot settle our local matters, there will be trouble. If the Tariff is left an open question, it is at least one step in the right direction.

Hon. MR. HELMCKEN—It is an open question on agricultural matters.

Hon. MR. CARRALL—I shall not attempt to answer the discursive remarks of the Hon. Mr. Wood, it would require an *ignis fatuus* to do so, for he is here, there, and everywhere in no time, but I cannot suffer some of his remarks to pass unnoticed. I have sat in this Council for two Sessions, and have endeavoured to conduct myself with propriety, but I find certain Hon. gentlemen in this Council who, by innuendo and implication, directly and indirectly, have endeavoured to cast slurs upon Canada, and to slander and be-little the Statesmen of that country, which I am proud to call my own. I have, hitherto, refrained from answering, because I thought my country occupied too high a place in the roll of England's Colonies to be affected by such conduct. The position of Canada is so great, beyond cavil and dispute, as not to require any defender in this Council. Such remarks only recoil upon those who make them; the versatility of spleen displayed by the Hon. gentleman who has just sat down, only shows the bitterness of the mind that conceived the remarks. The question now before us is as to Clause 8, and upon the discussion of this clause another question has arisen, or rather has been dragged in, namely, that of the ability of Canada to fulfil the conditions of this particular clause, and it is said that this is to be made a test question. With regard to the idea of any future Canadian Ministry repudiating this condition, I wish, Mr. Chairman, to refer you to English history, and to ask whether you have ever known an instance of an incoming Ministry, whether Whig, Radical, or Tory, repudiating the plighted troth of their predecessors in office. Such a thing is never done to my knowledge, and so far as my experience of history goes, never has been done. ["Hear, hear," from Hon. Attorney General]. I have yet to learn an instance where a loan guaranteed, or anything else undertaken by any Government, has been repudiated by an incoming Ministry. We might just as well suppose that the guarantee for the loan for the Inter-colonial Railway might be withdrawn by Gladstone, because it was given by the late Ministry, as that any future party in Canada might entertain the idea of going back from the promises of the present Government. History forbids such an idea. The Hon. and learned Member for Victoria (Mr. Drake) says he wants a guarantee. Well let him want it. I am perfectly willing that he should want it. For my part, I look upon the Queen's proclamation as the guarantee which will make the whole thing inviolable. I point to the fact, that every compact entered into with the Maritime Provinces is being fulfilled. Can anyone point to any act of repudiation? No, Sir, Canada has gone beyond her promises. I repudiate, on behalf of myself and others, the assertion that any member of the confederate party has stated that he would accept Confederation without conditions. I never heard the Hon. Member for Victoria District, or the Hon. Member for New Westminster, who have taken a prominent part in this great question, make any such statement. I have the honour of being one of the Executive Council who framed these Resolutions, and I believe the terms will be acceptable to a large majority of the people. Those who say that there can be no Union without a Railway, speak a fallacy. Railways follow. Look at San Francisco and the Eastern States of America. Look at Scotland and England. I am well aware that British Columbia wants a Railway, and I know that Canada wants it. I am sanguine enough to believe that it will be made. I am assured that the money is ready, if the desired guarantees can be obtained. The Hon. Mr. Wood, in his discursive remarks, flew around like a humming bird buzzing round a rose, and amongst other things touched on the assailability of the Railroad. I say that the American people have Railways of their own, and we do not intend to have from henceforth daily warfare. With regard to the course of the Railway, the Hon. Chief Commissioner has told you that the advantages of the line are greater than those of the existing Pacific line. It is well known that the American Pacific Railway, after passing Omaha, passes through a wild and most difficult country, through miles of wilds and sage brush. ["No, no," from Mr. DeCosmos]. The North-West Territory is more fertile than any portion of the route of the American Pacific Railway. The Hon. Mr. Wood says he will make this a test question. I say the whole terms are a test question, and no one part of them more than another. The Canadian Government are to be asked what they will do, and the final test will be for the decision of British subjects of this Colony. No one thing is a test more than another. The people have the sole right to say whether they are willing to take the terms as finally offered, or not. I have already spoken twice with regard to Representative Institutions, which the Hon. Mr. Wood regrets are not made a condition. Either I must fail to put my ideas clearly, or Hon. Members misunderstand me. I have said over and over again, that the people must decide this question. His Excellency says that if the newly constituted Council asks for Responsible Government, under the Organic Act, they will get it. What need is there to drag in the question into these Resolutions? The Hon. Mr. Wood cannot, dare not, say that the majority of the British subjects in British Columbia are in favour of Responsible Government. I may be found in the minority upon this question when it comes before the people, but I speak from conviction; and, moreover, I say that when once we are in the Dominion, if the people desire Responsible Government, no power on earth can prevent them from having it.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I heartily concur with the Hon. Mr. Wood, in his views on Responsible Government.

Hon. MR. WOOD—I never said I was in favour of Responsible Government. I say that the Governor asks for the ratification of the people, and at the same time denies that we are fit for self-government. I have never pledged myself to Responsible Government. [Oh! oh! oh!]

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I must oppose the amendment of the Hon. and learned member; first, because it raises invidious distinctions, and might lead to the inference that we were indifferent to the other portion of the terms; secondly, because it asks this House to do what it cannot, and even if it had the power, ought not to do. This Council is not the proper body to dictate final terms. This Council is only a quasi representative body, and does not fairly represent the people. With a House, constituted as this is, containing some Members who professedly only represent their own individual opinions, it would, in my opinion, be an insult to the people to make any condition a test of union, in the sense proposed. Suppose Canada sends back the terms without the Railway, it is for the people to accept or reject them; that is a right belonging to the people who have not yet been consulted. The Hon. Mr. Wood has said that there are Hon. Members in this House who would go in for Confederation on any terms. I, for one, have never done so; nothing is more foreign to my desires. [Hear, hear, from the Attorney General.] Though I am a Canadian, and am proud of my country, I am also a British Columbian, and upon this question, my first and last thought has been, is, and will be for British Columbia. ["Hear, hear," from the Attorney General].

Hon. MR. ALSTON—As as a test question, I must say I cannot vote for this amendment. If I am in this Council when the final votes upon Confederation are to be taken, I shall be prepared to vote against Confederation, unless a Railway is included in the terms, unless, that is to say, my sentiments undergo some

change which I do not foresee. I do not see how, if this were made a test question, the Government could carry out their instructions, first to submit the resolutions to Canada, and then to submit the Canadian terms to the people. This is not the time to submit a test question, neither can we arrogate to ourselves the power to do so, it must be left to the popular vote; therefore, although I fully concur in the sentiment that we must have a Railway some time or other, I must vote against this amendment.

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—Mr. Chairman, the sooner we get back to business the better. The discussion has become too wide. Some Hon Members seem to think that Canada can't do it, that too much money is required. What is the fact? We merely ask the Canadian Government to spend one Million a year. What is the interest on that sum, at 4 per cent? $40,000, and the next year $80,000. I dont know how long it will take to get to the Rocky Mountains. We want the Railway for our own purposes. ["Hear, hear, hear," from Hons. DeCosmos, Holbrook, and others.] We shall derive benefit from the expenditure of million dollars a year in the Colony, and be getting a Railway at the same time. Every one seems to think that the Railway will unite the country, so it will; but it is not simply a Railway or a Telegraph that will unite Canada and British Columbia. The only true basis of Union, is that people should have the same interests, the same feelings, and the same desire to make this a prosperous country. If Canada gives us terms sufficiently good to show that it is her intention to do all she can to develop our resources and advance our interests, then she will gain the affections of the people of this Colony, and then there will be an Union, which no Railway can give, a material Union which nothing can disturb, and we shall find hereafter that Kingdoms and Nations will spring out of this Union. We are told by the Hon. Mr. Wood, that the Officials must vote for these terms, as they have been settled by the Governor. This is not so, for before any terms can be concluded, some one must go to Canada from here, or come from Canada to this place, to arrange conditions. I believe in what His Excellency has said. I place more reliance on him than on any one else. I believe he will act fairly and justly in this matter, nor do I think there is so much to fear from Canada as there is from the danger of the people of this Colony cheating themselves; you can make the people believe anything. I do not agree that the country is in such a depressed condition; I know that Victoria, the chief city, is in rather a depressed condition, and perhaps New Westminster also, but outside it is otherwise.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—Is the gold mining interest prosperous?

Hon. Mr. HELMCKEN—The Hon. Member asks if the gold mining interest is prosperous. I say that this Colony has no business to depend upon its gold mining interests.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—What else has she got?

Hon Mr. HELMCKEN—She has agricultural interests, coal, lumber, and fisheries. What do you send away half a Million of dollars for each year? We want a more industrious population, a productive population. But to return to the Railway, the sooner we get through this Railway the better, it opens up so many avenues for discussion. I think it is the most essential part of this document. It is essential to Canada; through it she hopes to make a country of this Colony, and it is essential to us, as bringing us prosperity. I believe the Canadian Government will make the Railway in the interior. We are told that they have Four Millions lying idle, they cannot have a better investment for it than to build a Railroad from Fraser River to Kamloops.

Hon. Mr. DECOSMOS—I remark, Mr. Chairman, that there is a considerable contrast between the views of two Hon. Members of the Executive Council. I mean the Hon. Chief Commissioner (Mr. Trutch,) and the Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken.) The former says that it is not proposed to construct a Railway with reference to local interests. He says to advocate our own local interests is simply inapposite. I think differently. I think that we should deal with it locally as well as nationally. I presume it is put in the terms because it is expected that it will benefit the Colony. We don't care so much for its benefitting the people of Montreal as for benefitting ourselves; we look at it from a British Columbian point of view. I say with the Hon. Member for Victoria City (Dr. Helmcken,) that we should deal with it with reference to British Columbian interests. After the discussion of yesterday, I confess my surprise. I thought from the tenor of the Resolutions that the Canadian Government would construct the line. Now, we are informed by the Hon. Chief Commissioner that it will be undertaken by a private company. Then, he says if we cannot get a Railway we must have an equivalent. If this clause is not a fixed principle in the terms, then I ask what do the Government propose as an equivalent? With regard to Railway communication through British Columbia, we ought, in my opinion, to connect Kamloops and the adjacent country with the Seaboard. That is commencing at navigable water on Fraser River and ending at Savona's Ferry, Kamloops Lake. This line, at the utmost, is only 150 miles long. The expense of its construction, at $50,000 per mile, would be $7,500,000. We might safely approach the Canadian Government upon this, irrespective of the terms of union, but under the constitutional provision authorizing the Dominion Government to construct public works of this character.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I say again that the scheme of this Railway, on which this clause is based, hangs on the construction of the line from the Seaboard. I never said, and never intended to say, that we had no right to take into consideration whether or not local interests would be benefitted. I say that I would not dare to stand up here and advocate a special link of a special line. I should think if I did so that I was doing what the Canadian Government could not listen to. But in a great scheme which contemplates a line of Railway from the Seaboard of British Columbia to Canada, I consider that the Dominion Government may take a broad view and strain a point to get it. This clause has been drawn without pretending to define the route. I did not say that it was proposed that the line should be built by a private company. I said that it suggested itself to my mind that the line would be built by a private company, not that it was so proposed. I do not disregard local interests. I look upon this Railway as a necessity of the position—a means to the end. I do not advocate it on its merits as to local interests, I as a grand scheme of Transcontinental Railway. W Sir, some say that the terminus should be brought Esquimalt or Nanaimo. A Railway is wanted in the interests of the Confederacy, but the locality has been generalized as much as possible by the Government. This brings me to another point: though I look upon the Railway as a necessity of the position, in view of the approach of Confederation, I would not pledge myself to bind the Dominion Government to the special terms of this clause. I think it possible that terms may be suggested, instead of this condition, which may be found to be acceptable to the people of this Colony, to whom, as you know, His Excellency says the matter must be referred. I do not look upon the Railway as unessential. I say it is essential, for without unity of interests Confederation cannot endure. If I did not think that under Confederation we should be governed satisfactorily and to our advantage, I would oppose Confederation, and would advise its abandonment. I do not say, and I am not going to bind myself, that unless that clause is granted by Canada, I shall not vote for Confederation, although I think it essential to the position.

Hon. Mr. WALKEM—Mr. Chairman, having been unfortunately absent during the early part of this debate, I have not been able, hitherto, to take part in it. I adopt the principle laid down by the Hon. Chief Commissioner with regard to this clause, but I think the clause is not general enough. It is true, that it is sufficiently general as to a part, but not as to the whole. Enough has been said about the spending of $1,000,000, to show what it means. I would leave out the one million. It would be enough, in my opinion, to say that it shall be constructed within a reasonable time. This would mean not an indefinite, but a reasonable time; it would be so interpreted by the Law Courts. I would leave out the definition of time, and I would leave out the one million. I think it will do us injury with Canadian Statesmen; they will say that this is the measure of our desire to be confederated. There is another point to which I would call attention. The language of the clause does not, in my opinion, imply that one million must necessarily be expended within the Colony. I conclude, after hearing the explanations of Hon. Members, that it is intended that the one million shall be spent here, but in my opinion it might, under these words, be expended on any part of the line. I thought that was the intention; it was so thought in San Francisco. There were newspaper articles upon it, and the idea of a million a year being spent upon the Railway for a hundred years was laughed at on all sides. I would

suggest an alteration in the words. I am ready to leave the construction of the English to any Schoolmaster. I say that they do not mean "in the Colony." With regard to the remarks of the Hon. Member for Victoria District, I would remark that this is not really a final contract; and I agree with the Hon. Chief Commissioner that the clause ought to be general. The Canadian statesmen, with whom we are about to deal, are not mere tyros; and I say that the mention of this one million leaves it open to Canada to keep the time open. If they expend that sum upon any portion of the line, they will be able to prolong the building of the road as long as they please. And, although it may be said that Canada will take care of us, I say we ought to take care of ourselves. Let us get as good terms as possible, not trusting to the Canadians, but looking after our own interests. We should, in my opinion, abstain from all mention of one million dollars, or any other sum, otherwise the Canadian Government may say that on payment or expenditure of that sum they will have completed their bargain.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I rise, Sir, to defend my English. This clause was settled after much consideration, in the first place emanating from the Hon. Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works. I conceive that the words "and that a sum of not less "than $1,000,000 shall be expended in every year, "from and after three years from the date of Union, "in actually constructing the initial sections of such "Railway from the Seaboard of British Columbia, to "connect with the Railway system of Canada" fully convey the meaning that it was intended they should. The language means that the expenditure should be within this Colony, and it can mean nothing else. The Schoolmaster cannot have been where the Hon. Member has just visited, or he would not have so misconstrued this clause. I may confirm what the Hon. Chief Commissioner says, that if in communication with the Canadian Government it is found that they will not consent to the Railway, it is thought that we may obtain some equivalent. I must vote against the amendment of the Hon. Member for Victoria District (Mr. DeCosmos) as it proposes to enter into details affecting particular localities. I regret that the Hon. Member, who usually takes such large and extended views, should in this instance have taken so small and sectional a view of so large a scheme. The whole country will be just as much benefitted by the Railway as any one part of it. The Hon. and learned Member for Victoria City proposes a guarantee and a penalty, but he has not shown how we could enforce the penalty if we cannot compel the fulfilment of the terms. I think that the self-interests of Canada will be so identified with those of British Columbia that we shall require no further guarantee. If more is required, as the Hon. Member for New Westminster says, we have the assurance of the Imperial Government—the Queen's proclamation. I cannot say that I think that the Canadian interests are purely commercial. I have lived in Canada for several years, and while there did not regret to see the country divided against itself. Now, there is a national feeling growing up in that promising young country; her inhabitants are becoming more British in their feeling. I believe that Canada will, as she has heretofore done, carry out the terms that she makes in honour and good faith. It will be to her interest to do so; it will be to her interest to satisfy the interests of British Columbia.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—The question of the Railway should be put in a practical form. The people want a Railway from the head of navigation into the interior. Unless we get immediate benefit, I hold we had better have no Railway at all [laughter]. The Resolution of my Hon. colleague (Mr. DeCosmos) will give us immediate prosperity. Unless we get immediate advantage it very little use at all.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—There is one word in the Hon. Attorney General's speech that I desire to reply to. He said that my recommendation goes too much into matters of detail. I find as much detail in the Organic Act with reference to Railway communication to Halifax.

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I have a recommendation to move bearing on the Coach Road, as follows:—

"That a respectful address be presented to His Excellency recommending that clause 8 may be so altered as to include the section of the main trunk road of the Colony lying between Yale and New Westminster in the Coach Road which the Dominion Government is to be asked to construct within three years from the date of union."

I think, Sir, that it is obvious that if Canada is to be asked to construct a grand trunk road it is equally important that she should add a connecting link which is wanting.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—If we can get the Dominion Government to make this communicating link it will be a benefit to the whole Mainland.

Hon. DR. CARRALL—I shall support the recommendation of the Hon. Member for New Westminster.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—This recommendation is open to the same objection as the proposal of the Hon. Member for Victoria District. I must oppose it on principle.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—It was intended to add the words "and maintain" after "construct and open for traffic." The words have inadvertently been omitted. I propose to remedy the mistake, and I therefore move a respectful address to His Excellency suggesting that the words "and maintain" be added between the words "such" and "traffic," in the fourth line.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Robson, which was carried; then the recommendation of the Hon. Chief Commissioner, which was carried.

The recommendations of the Hon. Mr. Wood and of the Hon. Mr. DeCosmos, were put and lost.

Clause 8 was then passed as read.

Clause 9 was next read by the Chairman:—

"9. The Dominion shall erect and maintain, at "Victoria, a Marine Hospital, and a Lunatic Asylum, "either attached to the Hospital, or separate, as may "be considered most convenient

"The Dominion shall also erect and maintain a "Penitentiary, or other principal Prison, at such "place in the Colony as she may consider most suitable for that purpose."

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL moved the adoption of this clause.

The Hon. MR. ROBSON said:—Sir, upon this clause I have to move a recommendation that the Penitentiary shall be at New Westminster. I think that it will be admitted, on all hands, that the Penitentiary ought to be at New Westminster. Victoria and Esquimalt are named as sites for particular things, and why not New Westminster?

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—I second the recommendation of the Hon. Member for New Westminster. I think the Mainland ought to be considered; it is, of course, a matter of some consequence.

Hon. MR. HUMPHREYS—As a member from the Mainland, I shall oppose the recommendation. I am in favour of centralizing buildings.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Hon. Members seem to lose sight of the words: "or principal Prison." This does not mean exactly a Penitentiary, or other principal Prison for reforming criminals, the existing Prisons are too small for the purpose, and this really means a Prison for the detention of prisoners.

Hon. MR. DECOSMOS—The Dominion Government are bound, under the Organic Act, to provide a Penitentiary. This, I suppose, means more than the Organic Act contemplates, it means a Prison.

Hon. DR. HELMCKEN—Yes, that is the meaning, it means more than the Organic Act contemplates.

Hon. MR. WOOD—I think the Penitentiary ought to be in the best and most central place, wherever the Prison can be best maintained. I would leave it to the Dominion Government to decide the place.

Hon. MR. HOLBROOK—Why should not Victoria be struck out of this clause altogether?

Hon. MR. ROBSON—I did not suggest New Westminster in any local or sectional spirit. I rather did it to divest the clause of local and sectional spirit, though, at present, population and other things point to Victoria as the proper place for a Marine Hospital and Lunatic Asylum; but we must look to the future, the population must ultimately be largest on the Mainland. [Hon. Mr. Ring—"No, no"] Surely the Hon. Member for Nanaimo will not assert that the population of the Island will, in time to come, exceed that of the Mainland. I have no desire to give any sectional complexion to the Resolutions.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Sir, I desire to say that, in my opinion, the Penitentiary will ultimately be on the Mainland, perhaps at New Westminster or Burrard Inlet, where it is probable the Railway will come. I can easily believe that the Hon. Member for New Westminster does not advocate New Westminster from local motives, but I must defend the Resolution as it stands. I think it better to leave it to the people who find the money to select the place. The position is not the same as regards the Marine Hospital. It

should be at Victoria or Esquimalt, or at some intermediate place, on account of this being the head quarters of the Navy, just as I think Esquimalt is the proper place for the Dock. I believe that New Westminster will be the place, but I cannot, on principle, vote for the recommendation.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Robson to the Committee.—Lost.

Clause 9 was then passed as read.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I move the adoption of Clause 10, which reads thus:—

"10. Efficient Coast Mail Steam Service, in connection with the Post Office, shall be established "and maintained by the Government of the Dominion, "between Victoria and New Westminster, Nanaimo, "and such other places as may require such Services."

Until we have roads within the Colony, these services must be carried on for some time to come by water. I consider it to be a very proper item.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—I suggest the addition of Puget Sound.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I object to such an addition, because Puget Sound does not come within Coast Mail Service.

Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK—Then are we to suppose there are to be no other Ports of Entry, other than Victoria? ["No, no, no," from all sides.]

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. DeCosmos, which was lost.

Clause 10 was then passed as read.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I move the adoption of Clause 11, which is a general proposition, which will, I hope, meet with the approbation of the House. It is as follows:—

"11. Whatever encouragement, advantages, and "protection are afforded by the Dominion Government to the Fisheries of any of its Provinces, shall "be extended in similar proportion to British Columbia, according to its requirements for the time "being."

Clause 11 was passed as read.

The Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I move the adoption of Clause 12, which reads thus:—

"12. British Columbia shall participate, in fair "proportion, in any measures which may be adopted "and Funds which may be appropriated by the Dominion for the encouragement of Immigration."

Passed as read.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I now move the adoption of clause 13. The working of this clause is familiar to this Council from the debate which has already taken place. The basis is the population of 120,000 up to the date which is left blank. The clause is this:—

"13. British Columbia shall be entitled to be represented in the Senate by Four Members, and by "Eight Members in the House of Commons, until the "Year 18 , and thereafter the Representation in the "Senate and the House of Commons shall be increased, subject to the provisions of 'The British North "America Act, 1867.'"

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—Mr. Chairman, there seems to be a difficulty. The Organic Act, Section 51, provides for the re-adjustment of the representation after the census of 1871; and that the representation shall be based on the proportion of 65—the number that Quebec now has—to the population of Quebec. It ought to exist at this number until 1881, or 1891.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I would remark that in my opinion Clause 51 does not apply; we come in under Clause 146. The Hon. Members now representing Victoria City and District (Messrs Helmcken and DeCosmos.) when they proposed to telegraph were a little late. However if we now fix the date, for which a blank is purposly left, that will settle the matter beyond any doubt.

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—In my opinion, Sir, we are better off than if we were included. The only thing we have to do is to fix a date. If we put the date back to a remote period, we might be doing ourselves an injustice; for we might be entitled to more. I would put it off for 20 years, filling up the date by inserting 1891.

Hon. Mr. HOLBROOK—I think ten years quite enough, we shall have more than 120,000 in that time, and be entitled to increased representation.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—Mr. Chairman, during the previous debate, an Hon. Member referred to 120,000 as the basis of representation, as well as the basis of population. We find this echoed by others, last but not least by the Hon. the Attorney General himself. I am suprised to find the Hon. and learned gentleman setting this up as a basis. For the basis of representation under the Organic Act, was the basis of representation allowed to Quebec, that is, one member for every 20,000. It is proposed that we shall have eight members, then the population ought to be 160,000, but it is only set up as 120,000, which number would only entitle us to six members. Now, Sir, I have no objection to getting eight members for the House of Commons, and four for the Senate; but I do object to Hon. Members and Newspapers spreading abroad statements which have no foundation in fact. I think our population has been over estimated. It is going abroad that 120,000 is the proper foundation for representation, I say it it not so. The honest straightforward and manly course is for our Government to say to the Dominion Government, that it is necessary for us to have a larger representation on territorial grounds. The whole thing resolves itself into expediency; beyond expediency I say that no one can find a fulcrum for the assertion. I would cheerfully support twelve and six so far as it goes. But I do denounce that want of principle and want of truth that surrounds this basis. There is another question about the representation to which due attention does not seem to have been given, it is this: the electoral qualification in Canada is too high, and it will be most objectionable to have the same qualification thrust upon us. The qualification of members may safely be left to the Dominion Government. But that of electors is too high, and will be a source of irritation, which the Government should endeavour to remove now. I should have moved a recommendation as to this, but from the treatment which my amendments have received in this House, I am inclined to let it pass; and I shall move my amendments before my constituencies.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Dewdney, the Committee rose, reported progress, and asked leave to sit again.

Several Members having left the House, on motion of the Hon. Mr. Robson, the Committee sat again.

Hon. Dr. HELMCKEN—Mr. Chairman, I find the average of representation in the Dominion Parliament is one member to 15,000. That on the basis of 120,000 gives eight members. Nova Scotia has 19 members for 30,000, New Brunswick has 12, Newfoundland has 8 members. All we have to do is to take care that we are not included in the census of 1871. Our number cannot be diminished, so we may put it at 81 safely. As for fictitious numbers it is useless to talk about it.

Hon. Dr. CARRALL—I move that the date "1881" be inserted

Hon. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I do not see that of necessity the number cannot be decreased. I would name a more distant date.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I would not take a more distant date, because I think we shall have a larger population in 1881.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—From Section 61 of the Organic Act, I think our number might be reduced. I think it improbable we shall have a population of 120,000 in 1881. And if we have not that number then, I think it possible that we may be reduced. I shall therefore vote for 1891.

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I shall support the date 1891.

Hon. Mr. WOOD—I move a recommendation to insert the words "not less than," before "4 and 8," and after the word "eighteen" to insert "91."

Hon. ATTORNEY GENERAL—I cannot see the use or necessity for the words "no less."

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—I think the words are important. We might in 1881 be entitled to more or less.

Hon. Mr. DRAKE—I hold to 91, because I think it likely we might be reduced if we fix the date at 81.

Hon. Mr. DeCOSMOS—I think we ought to fix a minimum number and keep to it, and a date, because I think that when the distrust wears away, British Columbia may be content with three in the Senate, and six in the House of Commons.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Drake, to fill up the blank with the figures "91." Carried.

The Chairman put the recommendation of the Hon. Mr. Wood, "That the number of members to the Commons should never be less than 8, and to the Senate never less than 4." Carried.

Clause 14 was then passed as read.

The Committee rose, and reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again on Friday at 1 o'clock.

FRIDAY, March 18th, 1870.

The HON. ATTORNEY-GENERAL—I rise to move the adoption of clause 14. These terms, or rather the terms which come back from Canada, will of necessity come before the new electoral body, whose existence His Excellency has shadowed forth, and the particulars as to the division into districts must be left for the decision of that House. It is impossible at present to specify the time.

HON. MR DECOSMOS—Cannot an approximate time be named; besides there are other things upon which the country will want information. Such for instance, as whether the voting for members will be by ballot, and what is to be the qualification of voters. I think it ought to be fixed. The Dominion law is more illiberal than that to which the people of this country have been accustomed. I believe in the ballot, but it will be better to leave it to the constituencies.

HON. CHIEF COMMISSIONER—This clause has been left general, that it may be settled by the newly constituted Council.

HON. DR HELMCKEN—If there is a qualification for the House of Commons it must be general for the whole Dominion. At present I believe the qualification is that existing in the Provinces before Union, ultimately there must be qualification for the whole Dominion.

HON. DR. CARRALL—There is no general law for qualification.

HON. MR. HUMPHREYS—The clause is indefinite and dangerous. The Dominion qualification will virtually disfranchise half the British settlers in British Columbia. We are legislating in the interests of the people, this ought to be determined at once.

HON. MR. DECOSMOS—I believe in British subjects, having a fixed residence, and of a certain age, voting in British Columbia. It should be a residential manhood suffrage.

HON. DR HELMCKEN—We cannot deal with the subject now. It is impossible to divide the colony into districts until we know how many senators we are to have.

HON MR. HOLBROOK—Mr. Chairman, I move a recommendation to strike out the words "if any."

HON. MR WOOD—I think the words ought to stand. The Organic Act says that senators shall be elected for districts, but it may be desirable that senators should be appointed for the whole colony, they are nominated, and nominated because they are the best men that the Governor can obtain. [No, no, no—Hon DeCosmos.] I believe the Executive are in the best position to know whether the principle of appointing senators is best or whether they should go for the whole colony.

HON. MR HUMPHREYS—As this stands it throws the whole power into the hands of the Canadians. The Lieut Governor will be a Canadian and will name Canadians. We ought to know by whom these appointments are to be made.

HON. MR. ROBSON—It is a great pity that these national differences should be allowed to prevail, we ought to consider ourselves British Columbians. The Governor-General, with the consent of his Council, appoints the Lieut.-Governor, and the Lieut.-Governor, with the advice of his Cabinet, recommends the Senators. [No, no, hon Dr Helmcken.] Yes, it is so; he recommends to the Governor-General who appoints. It is a great pity to raise these disputes about Englishmen and Canadians.

HON MR HUMPHREYS—It is all very well to talk that way. I maintain that the Englishmen sitting at this table have said less as to nationality than the Canadians. We want to be governed by British Columbians.

HON DR HELMCKEN—We had better drop these nationalities.

HON MR WOOD—The hon member for New Westminster should not be angry because we want to provide against the possibility of ill feeling by timely precaution 'Safe bind, safe find.' When the Governor-General appoints Senators, if I understand it right, he appoints the political friends of his Cabinet. If we are to have responsible government there will always be some check, if not we may be in the position of having members selected by the Lieut-Governor without the assistance of any responsible Cabinet. [Hear, hear, hon DeCosmos.] A Canadian Lieut-Governor will act with the same sort of feeling that the English Government will. Senators will be selected by favoritism, and supporters of Confederation will doubtless be selected in this colony unless we have responsible government and representative institutions in full vigor. Canadian interests will doubtless be very prominent in this colony and power acts injuriously on the human mind—it is one of the corrupters of the mind.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—I should be sorry to see the word 'if any' struck out; their retention leaves the matter open. Hon members seem to have forgotten that Senators must be residents of British Columbia. Probably they may be elected on the ground of their having an appreciation of the whole country instead of a section only. It may be that Senators will be appointed for the whole colony.

HON MR HOLBROOK.—After hearing the explanations of the hon Attorney-General, I feel more desirous to press my recommendation, to show that we from the Mainland desire to have our fair share of representation. I think the words most objectionable.

HON MR DECOSMOS.—I find by the resolutions passed at the conference of delegates in London, that Senators were to be taken from the Legislative Council. We are told by the Government that we are to go into Confederation without responsible government, then we ought to have a guarantee that the first Senators shall be representative men, and that they shall not be chosen by the Governor, and put into office for life without reference to the people.

HON MR HUMPHREYS.—I shall move a recommendation that the first Senators shall be nominated by the Legislature.

HON DR HELMCKEN.—The position will be worth $600. The difficulty will be to get anyone to go there. People are chary of going into the Legislative Council now, and they will not be very anxious to go to Canada. As to choosing Senators from one place it is out of the question. And it is equally out of the question to appoint them by the Legislative Council.

HON MR HUMPHREYS.—We are here as the agents of the people, delegates in point of fact, and we are bound to legislate in accordance with the well understood wishes of the people. In reference to having these Senators appointed, we are bound to see what they are and whether the people are likely to approve of our acts.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Hon members must remember that these resolutions will be submitted to the people, a much abused term, as the hon member for Victoria District has truly said, and our common object must be to make the terms acceptable to the people. They will have to pass upon them in the last resort, and to say we will or we will not have them

HON MR PEMBERTON.—The objection seems to me to be dividing British Columbia into districts. It is a qualification for Senators that they must reside in their districts, therefore I think it will not be desirable to divide the colony into districts. I think the clause should stand as it is.

HON MR ROBSON—One matter deserves attention in connection with this item. I believe that the indemnity to Senators is six hundred dollars as a lump sum, without traveling expenses. I think it is now commuted, and this would place British Columbia Senators at a disadvantage with others. It is no hardship to other Provinces, but would be most unfair upon British Columbia, traveling expenses both ways should be allowed.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—My conviction is that mileage is now allowed. If I am right ten cents a mile both ways is allowed.

HON MR BARNARD—It is the prerogative of the Governor; we had better vote for the repeal of the Organic Act.

HON MR DECOSMOS—Under the proposed constitution Senators would be chosen by an irresponsible Governor, on the advice of an irresponsible Minister; those who own this country do not want such a state of things to be.

HON MR WOOD—It is better to bear in mind that the Organic Act applies to three or at the most four Provinces: Canada East, Canada West and the Maritime Provinces, here we want exceptional terms.

HON MR ROBSON—Hon members seem to assume that we are going to enter Confederation without responsible government. This I repudiate. I say we shall enter with privileges equal to other Provinces. I decline to assume anything else. With regard to the appointment of Senators by the Legislative Council, I would ask by what Council? By this or by the new House? It would not satisfy the people that a Council nominated by the Governor should appoint, and it is yet to be seen that the new House, as shadowed forth by the Governor, would be less objectionable than this one. We are entirely in the dark.

HON MR HUMPHREYS—As I understand it these Senators are to be appointed after Confederation, and consequently the recommendation refers to the new Council. His Excellency says that he will give a majority to the popular members, and I have no doubt he means what he says. I believe him to be a most estimable gentleman, but I have a feeling that he has been misled; it is not likely that in a few weeks' travel he could understand the wants and feelings of the people; you must eat, drink and sleep amongst them to understand a people. If I were a great Government contractor I would support the Government. I ask some reason of rank; it would be very easy to give us a majority of two or three popular members, but unless we have a large majority of Representative members the Government might still get their own way.

HON MR ROBSON—I desire, Mr. Chairman, to answer two points. I believe we shall fight for and have responsible Government. In referring to the Governor's speech, the Hon. member for Lillooet, says the new Council will be just similar to this, that it will still be unrepresentative. I cannot see why there should be this doubt about the Constitution of the new Council If there were to be only a majority of two or three the Council would still be unrepresentative, and the people will not be contented with such a form of Government. The argument of the honorable member for Lillooet refutes itself in the most conclusive way. The people do not want an unrepresentative House, not having their confidence to elect their senators.

HON MR KING—What have we to do with the Organic Act? Why should we put ourselves under the iron points of the Organic Act, and be dragged under a harrow all the days of our lives? If the act is wrong it must be repealed. Now is the time to express our opinion.

THE CHAIRMAN put the recommendation of Mr. Humphreys, which on division was lost, and of Mr. Robson, which on division was lost.

Clause fourteen passed as read.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—Sir: I rise to move the adoption of clause fifteen, which is as follows:

15. The constitution of the Executive authority and of the Legislature of British Columbia shall subject to the "British North America Act, 1867," continue as existing at the time of union, until altered under the authority of the said act.

And before touching upon the merits of the resolution itself I wish to explain that the time which must necessarily elapse before Confederation will allow ample opportunity to procure a change in the Constitution, and I desire to impress upon hon members that this question of alteration in the form of Government, is not necessarily connected with the resolution now before the House. I make these observations in consequence of observing a notice of the hon member for Lillooet on the subject of responsible government on the orders of the day. On behalf of the Government I desire to say that there is no desire whatever to shirk the full discussion of the question of responsible government. I throw the door open and invite the fullest discussion, but as the question of the change of the constitution of this colony is one that lies between this colony and the Imperial Government, it does not form an item in these resolutions, therefore I would ask hon members to postpone the consideration of responsible government and pass these resolutions. On a question of such importance a special day, irrespective of these resolutions, should be set apart for discussion—there is no desire whatever on the part of the Government to shirk the question. The matter of the constitution is under negotiation between this colony and the Imperial Government at this moment. Supposing these resolutions are passed, other negotiations must take place. First, Canada has to accept them, then there is reference back to British Columbia to submit to the popular vote, so that there will be full time allowed for the new institutions to be inaugurated if the people say that they do not want the terms, but that they want responsible government, they will undoubtedly get it. I cannot conceive our going into Confederation with a Crown Council—we must expect to go in with fuller representative institutions. If we do not have Confederation under these terms, we shall nevertheless have representative institutions and a majority under the Imperial Act will have the power to change and get responsible government, that is party government. My point is, that it is not necessary to drag in responsible government now; it is not necessary to mix it up with these resolutions. Our vote on this resolution need not be decided on responsible government, or party government. We shall still be open to send any other resolution on the subject of party government to the Governor. I therefore throw out the invitation to discuss it more fully on a future day. I feel sure that if this course is adopted the discussion will be more free.

HON MR KING—I think, Sir, that his Excellency's message, if I may so call these resolutions, invites us to discuss responsible government. Sir, we have been in former days favored with representative institutions, and have been defrauded of them. I desire to know what we have gained by the irresponsible government that has for some years past oppressed us. What I ask has been done about the various questions that have come up—the

Sisters rocks, the Court of Appeal—the answer has been, no funds. Where do the funds come from? From the people. If the Governor heard the views of the people he might, perhaps, change his views. I ask hon members here, who have lived under responsible government in Great Britain, (Hear, hear from Mr DeCosmos) not to be recreant to their country. Hon members on the other side say they are against responsible government and refer to a former House of Assembly of Vancouver Island. This is no argument. I trust that hon members loving British institutions will be true to their country, because there are defects in some assemblys do not let us run into the abject error of saying we are not fit for self government. We have borne this too long; do not let us hand over to Canada our consent to submit to this degradation; let us not say we are unfit; that we surrender the question of self government. Who, I ask, has examined the people? Who has tried them and discovered whether or not they are competent to exercise the privileges of responsible government? There are many points in this clause which demand discussion, but I am not going to exhaust myself. I say, however, that the question of responsible government must be considered. I throw the gauntlet down

Hon Mr HUMPHREYS—Mr Chairman, as mover of the resolution on responsible government, I do not think it necessary to take up the time of the House. I am perfectly satisfied in my own mind that the official members are convinced that the people are in favor of responsible government. As a student of history, young as I am, I begin to realize this truth; that all liberty and improvement has been infused into communities by the shock of revolution, or violent agitation. There is no hope of political improvement in time of tranquility and without agitation. The official members of this council are remarkable for their profound indifference to right and wrong. It is in their interest to postpone the settlement of this question of responsible government. I hold that there is a great necessity for this resolution; the question ought to be settled now and forever. Why should we be compelled, year after year, to fight these battles for reform over and over again; let this question be settled so that we may have leisure for other things. Hon gentlemen say the people are not in favor of responsible government; time will show. I say that they will almost as a unit insist upon it, and I lay down this proposition—no responsible government, no Confederation; no Confederation, no pensions. Instead of tightening the governmental reins they should be slackened. If responsible government is not granted these officials will still lose their power; for then in all probability a mightier nation than Canada will take charge of us. I am in favor of Confederation if it gives us permanent advantages not otherwise. We must have a free constitution. My conscience tells me that my votes on these resolutions are not prompted by selfish motives; if the people get responsible government I am satisfied. His Excellency admits that he would not like to extend the liberal form of government to this colony. My opinion is that there is no community unfit to govern themselves; government is not a complicated machine, there is very little difference between carrying on a government and carrying on a business. One-half of the depression in this colony is in my opinion attributable to the despotic form of government. Just fancy the head of a mercantile house allowing his clerks to carry on the whole business of the firm as they pleased. (Hear, hear from Mr DeCosmos) Without responsible government you will lose Confederation; it is not necessary to say anymore; let us have something like the government of Ontario. Those whom I have the honor to represent sent me here to advocate responsible government. I will read from a petition now in my hands.

Hon Attorney General—This is out of order; I rise to call the hon member to order; this is not the time to present a petition.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—The hon member has a right to read from it.

Chairman—The hon member cannot read from a petition which has not been presented to and received by this House.

Hon Mr Robson—Mr Chairman, I request that you will be careful in ruling on this matter. Hon members have the right to read from documents to show the views of their constituents. It is alluded to as the best means of acquainting the House with the views of the constituency which the hon member represents.

Hon Attorney-General—On the other hand I would say that the right of petitioners must be respected, and if hon members are allowed to read petitions, then petitions can be got in by a side wind

Hon Mr Robson—In my opinion the hon member has a right to read from a document of this kind.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Having looked at this document I see it is not a petition to this House and may therefore be quoted.

The Chairman having looked at the document decided that it might be quoted.

Hon Mr Humphreys then read a portion of the prayer of the petition, which purported to be to Her Majesty the Queen;

Hon Mr. Robson—The honorable and learned Attorney General has appealed to those honorable members who are in favor of responsible Government to postpone the question for the present. I should be glad to accede to the request if the honorable and learned gentleman will meet the objections that present themselves to my mind as to that course. In my opinion to vote for this section now will preclude the possibility of our bringing on the subject of responsible Government in the House this session. We shall be met with the assertion that it has been already discussed and decided for this session. I am quite sure the honorable and learned Attorney General does not wish to catch us in a trap.

Hon Attorney General—Certainly not. As honorable members have insisted upon opening the question, I now propose to go on with the discussion.

Hon Mr Robson—I am most anxious to meet the views of the Government in this matter, if possible, but as we are asked to vote aye or no upon this clause, I say that in voting for it we shall be casting our votes in direct opposition to Responsible Government.

Hon Attorney General—The discussion must go on now; you have begun, it is too late to withdraw; the lists are closed, and the gang of battle down.

Mr Robson—Mr. Chairman, I will address myself to the question before the House, which I feel to be the most important clause in these terms; a question, in fact, which underlies the peace, prosperity and happiness of British Columbia; a question which, if carelessly or improperly treated now, may eventuate in the most serious consequences to the Colony; for I believe the people are as ready now as in earlier days to fight for freedom, and to shed their blood in defense of their political rights. It becomes us, then, to be candid with ourselves and with each other, very serious, firm and dispassionate in discussing this clause, as it might result in most disastrous consequences. As I read the clause it places it beyond the power of the Colonists to obtain the form of Government which they, I believe, really want, and if we pass it we shall obtain no more than that slightly more liberal form, which is foreshadowed in his Excellency's speech, under the cover of representative Government. Profoundly impressed as I am, with the gravity of the subject we are now called upon to consider, any remarks I may be enabled to offer will proceed rather from a sense of duty to my constituents and to my country than from any hope of changing the views or influencing the vote of any honorable member. What is responsible Government? I have been led to believe that considerable confusion of Ideas exists upon this point; and I was the more impressed with this upon listening to the remarks of the honorable member for Cariboo, a few days ago. That honorable gentleman compared the introduction of responsible Government into this colony to applying the machinery of the Great Eastern to a dairy churn. Now, sir, responsible Government is not a quantity; it is a principle; and as such it is applicable to the Great Eastern or to a dairy churn, capable of being applied to a tiny lady's watch. It is a principle admirably adapted to the largest communities in the Old World. It is a principle admirably adapted to the smallest communities in the New World. It is a principle that may be worked out in a cabinet of a hundred. It is a principle which may be successfully worked out in a cabinet of three. Without it no Government can, in the true sense, be called a peoples' Government. All true Governments derive their power from the people. All true Governments must be responsible to the people. Responsible Government is, then, a principle which may be adapted to, and successfully worked out in this community. If this proposition is incontrovertible, which I maintain it is, who can say that British Columbia is not large enough for responsible Government. There are men here of ability to form a cabinet. The Cabinet of the day is, under the responsible system, the Government. Just so long as it has the confidence of a majority of the representatives of the people in the House. In the event of that confidence being lost, one of two courses is open. The Ministers place their resignation in the hands of the Governor, who commonly calls upon a prominent member of the opposition to form a Ministry; or if they believe that the House does not truly represent the people upon the question at issue, they advise a dissolution and an appeal to the country. What would responsible Government have to do here? In dealing with this question I, of course, assume British Columbia to be a province of the dominion, and I confess, that were it otherwise, were it proposed to remain a separate colony the case would be different. I do not say that even then I would not advocate the introduction of responsible Government, but that advocacy might be less hearty and less firm. Regarding British Columbia as a province of the dominion, the chief objections are removed by the removal to Ottawa of all those larger and more complex questions of legislation which might threaten to crack the brain of our embryo statesmen. The local Government would alone have to deal with local questions, and thus it would have very simple duties to discharge, scarcely more difficult, in fact, than those falling within the functions of a large municipality in Canada. Are the people in British Columbia fit for it? And here I would express my sincere regret that the representative of her Majesty in this colony has felt it to be his duty to pronounce an adverse opinion. I will yield to no one, either in this House or out of it, in entertaining a high respect for his Excellency, for his talent, experience, and honesty of purpose. But I do say, and I say it with respect, more in sorrow than in anger, that I cannot think his knowledge of the people of this colony was such as to justify him in so early pronouncing upon their fitness for self-government.

Attorney General—The honorable member for New Westminster will, I am sure, pardon the interruption, but I feel it my duty to deny that the Governor ever said, or that any member of the Government has said or thought that the people of British Columbia are unfit for self government.

Mr Robson—I thank the honorable and learned Attorney General, and I appreciate his motives. There is no one less disposed than myself to speak or write one word calculated to weaken the hands of the Government, or cause the well-deserved popularity of his Excellency to wane; but yet I cannot conceal from myself the fact that a mere play upon words will not mend matters. Whether it is the colony or its inhabitants that has been pronounced unfit for self-government, the practical results remain the same, and it is with these we alone are concerned. From my own knowledge of the people, and it is the result of eleven years' contact with them, I have no hesitation in saying they are pre-eminently fitted for self government. There are scores of men in the country with callused palms and patched garments well fitted by natural endowments, education and practical experience in the working of responsible Government in other colonies, to occupy seats either in the Legislative Assembly or in the Cabinet of British Columbia. He who would judge of the intelligence and mental acquirements of men in this colony by outward appearance and by present occupation certainly would not judge righteous judgment. The opinion of his Excellency the Governor to the contrary, notwithstanding, I boldly assert that the people of British Columbia are fit for responsible Government. Do they want it? Doubtless there are those in this House, possibly even in the unofficial ranks, who will deny that the people of British Columbia really desire to have responsible Government under confederation. It is sometimes difficult to account for divergence of opinion; but I venture to think that I have the weight of both argument and evidence on my side when I assert, as I do, that the great body of the people, certainly an overwhelming majority, do earnestly and intelligently desire that form of government. It is difficult to believe that any man who has given due thought to the subject can possibly hesitate. Look at the position this colony would occupy under Confederation, without the full control of its own local affairs—a condition alone attainable by means of responsible government. While the other Provinces only surrender Federal questions to the central government, we would surrender ALL. While the other Provinces with which it is proposed to confederate upon equal and equitable terms retain the fullest power to manage all provincial matters, British Columbia would surrender that power—her local as well as her national affairs would virtually be managed at Ottawa. Could a union so unequal be a happy and enduring one? The compact we are about to form is FOR LIFE. Shall we take into it the germ of discord and disruption? The people desire change; but they have no desire to exchange the Imperial heel for the Canadian heel. They desire political manumission. I stand here, and, in the name of my ancestors, protest before Heaven against the surrender of constitutional rights purchased by the best blood of our race—a priceless legacy we have no right to barter away, even if we would. We owe it to our ancestors to preserve entire those rights which they have delivered to our care. We owe it to posterity not to suffer their dearest inheritance to be destroyed. But, if it were possible for us to be insensible of these sacred claims, there is yet an obligation binding upon ourselves, from which nothing can acquit us; a personal interest which we

cannot surrender. To alienate even our own rights would be a crime as much more enormous than suicide, as a life of civil security and political freedom is superior to a condition of serfdom; and if life be the bounty of Heaven, we scornfully reject the noblest part of the gift if we consent to surrender that certain rule of living and those constitutional rights, without which the condition of human nature is not only miserable but contemptible. I know but too well that the people of this colony have, during these years past, been unjustly and unconstitutionally deprived of their rights; but the perpetration of a wrong in the past can neither be no argument for perpetuating that wrong in the future; and it would appear a most fitting moment, when a new constitution is about to be offered, to demand the full restoration of political rights of which we have been for some time so unjustly deprived. A word about the constitution which the Governor proposes to confer upon this colony. Regarding it in the dim light shed upon it by the Executive, it is not unfair to assume that there will be one more popular member taken into the Executive, and that the people will have a majority of two in the Legislature. Let us suppose that the Legislative Council has 20 members, 11 elected by the people and 9 appointed by the Governor. Three are taken from the 11 into the mysterious chamber of the Executive, where they become—I will not say corrupted—manipulated, educated to see things somewhat differently from what they saw them before. In a House so constituted, is it unfair, is it uncharitable to conclude that, on all government measures at least, the government would command a majority? Take 3 from 11 and 8 remain. Take 3 from 20 and how many remain to the government? Is it not 12? Where, then, is the people's majority under the proposed constitution? And yet I am constantly told that this is not the proper time to ask for responsible government—that if the people want it they will possess, under the new constitution, the ready means of obtaining it. Sir, I do not see the matter in that light. I see in the proposed constitution a condition of things which promises a five years', possibly a ten years' agitation for what the people are prepared for now, desire now, are entitled to now. All governments are naturally conservative. All persons holding positions of honor, power or emolument are conservative. Think you those holding office by appointment will favor or promote a change which would make them responsible to the people—exchange their commission from the Crown for the more brittle tenure of 'public opinion'? On the contrary, we should find those in power opposed to the people in their struggle for responsible government; and how long the struggle might last it would be idle to predict. Besides, the people of Canada do not desire to see British Columbia occupying any such false position. They love too well the value of free institutions, and their adaptation to new countries to think of withholding them from us. These institutions were not won without a long and bloody struggle, even in Canada; and the prosperity and contentment of that people date from the inauguration of responsible government. The failure of representative institutions formerly enjoyed upon this island, is frequently cited as an argument against responsible government being introduced here. I admit the partial failure of those institutions. That failure was not, however, on account of the institutions being 'representative', but because they were not 'responsible.' The essential principle was wanting. There was no constitutional connecting link—no bond of sympathy between those who sat by the will of the people and those who sat contrary to, and in defiance of, that will. The system, painted, though it was, in popular dress, was rotten at the core—proved a delusion and a sham. The people, sometimes in indifference and contempt, permitted unsuitable men to be elected, and the whole thing came to rack and ruin. I, is to avoid a repetition of that unseemly farce that the people demand that any new constitution which may be conferred upon this colony shall be based upon the only true principle of responsibility. This question should be finally settled. The colony desires political rest. To inaugurate a fresh political agitation with union is most undesirable and might lead to disastrous results. The possible consequence of a refusal to grant responsible government coincident with Confederation is a part of the subject I almost hesitate to touch. I would neither prophesy, predict nor threaten; but I would ask the government to read well and carefully the lessons written in blood in other countries. Human nature is much the same on both sides of this great continent. Has the Anglo-Saxon race become so utterly degenerate here that it is prepared to barter away for mere money emoluments those rights which were purchased with so much blood elsewhere? I utterly refuse to think so—nay, I scorn the idea. We have seen that even the half-breeds at Red River have too much of the oil blood in their veins to permit a fancied political wrong. I am not going to predict a rebellion here. Sensible people there may be among us who feel it my duty to warn the government against unnecessarily provoking such a possible contingency. Why should there be such an unaccountable antipathy to investing the people of British Columbia with those political powers enjoyed under the British Constitution? Why is the present form of government so unpopular with the people? I will tell you why. It is just because it is not a people's government. They had no hand in making it. They have none in working it. They have no hand in making it. Only let the people have a hand in forming the Government, in selecting men of their own choice to rule over them, and we would find a popular government, a strong government, strong in the heart and confidence of the people. The very same gentlemen who are unpopular now, because ruling without the consent of the people, would be popular then, because ruling by the act and with the consent of the people. The people of British Columbia are naturally a conservative people. Restore to them their political rights, and no Government would need to fear an undue desire for change. The people know best how to manage their own local affairs. Depend upon it, sir, the people are seldom wrong in their opinions; in their sentiments they are never mistaken. Those now in power have a great responsibility resting upon them. Upon the manner in which they acquit themselves in regard to this very question may hang the most momentous consequences. Will they promote everlasting wellbeing? or precipitate untold evil? Heaven grant that they may do right! I stand here to day to advise and warn, not to threaten and predict. The Government has a very grave responsibility in this matter, and may well take a lesson from other countries. The possible consequence of a refusal to grant a reasonable request may be a repetition of the Red River trouble. Let not the government make a fatal mistake, or they may find themselves in a state of political agitation that may lead to the most serious consequences. I believe that, under circumstances analogous to what occurred in the Red River Territory, the Imperial Government would treat the inhabitants of this colony with even more consideration. It would not be a question of bayonets and fleets to coerce this colony; but it would be a question of what concessions ought to be made. I say that the Government have an opportunity now not only of shunning evil but of doing a great work. Oh! let not the Government make the fatal mistake of saying the people shall not manage their own affairs. Do not let them make the fatal mistake of compelling the people to reject these conditions at the polls. Now I have discharged a duty; I have said all I feel called upon to say at this stage. I have stated my own views and, I venture to think, those of an overwhelming majority of the people of British Columbia as well as of my own constituents. I trust the Government will take care how they force a vote on this question which affects this whole community (Hear, hear). This is, in a sense, distinct from the conditions, and it is probable that the Governor must obtain what we are now asking from a different quarter. But, obtain it from where he will, it must, I say, be obtained.

I beg to move the following amendment, as meeting the case more fully than the resolution offered by the hon member for Lillooet:

'Whereas no union can be either acceptable or satisfactory which does not confer upon the people of British Columbia as full control over their own local affairs as is enjoyed in the other Provinces with which it is proposed to confederate, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, That an humble address be presented to His Excellency the Governor, earnestly recommending that a Constitution based upon the principle of Responsible Government existing in the Province of Ontario, may be conferred upon this colony, coincident with its admission into the Dominion of Canada.'

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL.—Allow me to observe on this, that the on member is asking the Government to grant what it has no power to give.

HON MR ROBSON—The Governor has promised to seek the power to grant us a new constitution. We only ask that in that new constitution we may have responsible government.

HON MR DECOSMOS.—Mr Chairman, I do not intend to occupy the House for many minutes. I agree with the hon member for Lillooet and I disagree with the hon member for New Westminster. I think, sir, that we ought to have representative institutions and responsible government irrespective of Confederation. The hon member for New Westminster's proposition unites it with Confederation. I think this is a mistake, but it is of no matter so long as we get it. I look upon British Columbia as a municipality under the British Crown. Under Canada it will be a municipality with less power. Anyone who knows anything of municipal law knows that it is based upon three principles: Territory, authority and responsibility. This colony has the first two, and we are now asking for the third, and the terms sent down to the Council do not contain the elements of responsibility of the Executive to the people. Everything is tending to this point. Without responsibility, no matter how elective the new Council is, it will be a failure. The people want responsible government and representative institutions under any circumstances. I think the people would be traitors to themselves if they accepted any form of government which had not the element of responsibility. I would rebel if they were enough like me in the colony, and arrest every member of the Government that I thought was robbing me of my rights. I would go to a further extreme. However, I shall not trouble the House with a long speech on this matter, as I consider it of little use. This question ended, I am contented to leave this Council and go to my constituents.

HON DR DARRAH.—Mr chairman, I should like to ask what all this breeze is about? It is perfectly clear to all that as soon as we enter the Confederacy the people of this country can have any form of government they desire. I refuse to take up the issue without Confederation, in a state of isolation. We are dealing with Confederation. I am equally with the hon member for New Westminster, aware of the useless boon of responsibility, which exists in England, which may fairly be called the Standard-Bearer of nations. And I am equally aware that the same responsibility does not exist in the United States. During the late war I was in the United States' army. Stanton, the then secretary of War, was a most unpopular man. They wanted to get rid of him, but he could not be removed. When I took the ground that responsible government was not expedient, it was not because I did not approve of the system. It is, I say, the wisest and best form of government, but it is too cumbrous for this colony. I will repeat my objections; The Council contains no men of influence, the constituencies are too remote, and the inhabitants are all engaged in brand-seeking; there are few men of independent means who would take part in responsible government and consequently the election of public affairs would fall into the hands of men who are not fitted or qualified to govern the country, or otherwise into the hands of Victorians; neither of which I, for one, wish to see. How unfortunate it would be for Cariboo[illegible] if the hon senior member for Victoria (Dr Helmcken) were elected for Cariboo, I say, then that it must fall into bad hands, or into the hands of Victorians. I offer that argument as a British Columbian. The Executive Council do not care one fig what sort of government the people take. The Executive say the question is one for the people to decide. We have a measure of responsibility now. The hon member for New Westminster says that His Excellency will do certain things. I take his speech as it reads, and I have no doubt that a majority of the people's representatives will sit round the board, none know how great the majority will be. (Attorney General—Hear, hear.) Responsible government has never been made a distinct issue throughout the colony. (Mr Ker, Mr DeCosmos.) The hon member says that it has; I say it has not. It has been named with Confederation but not by itself; and until it is made a separate question my advice to the Governor will be not to grant it. The Governor has left you to choose any government you deem best. Do you think it would be better to have as permanent heads of departments two or three gentlemen who are familiar with the wants of the colony, or a moveable ministry going out on a question of repairs to Cowichan road, or something of that kind. These are amongst the things that you have to consider, and if, after due consideration, the people desire responsible government they will have it. I am here to state that his Excellency the Governor has no wish or desire to keep back responsible government. If he had any such desire it is likely that he would have reconstituted his Executive Council so as to make it elective? I apprehend that people do not consider what they are talking about when they ask for responsible government; they have not probably considered the failures that have been made in respect of responsible government; there have been some failures, as, for instance, in Jamaica and in Victoria. A class of people get into power under responsible government whom no person would like to have as rulers. There are petty interests mixed up with politics in small communities which prevent the system working so well in them, as in large countries like Great Britain, where there is a healthy tone, and a vast population and consequently great questions of national importance. I maintain that after Confederation the questions connected with local affairs will be so small and so entirely connected with particular localities that a staff of permanent heads of departments will be far better for the colony than responsible

government. I make this statement from conviction. I am perfectly free to take any course I like, notwithstanding I am an Executive Councillor. My position has not in any way curtailed my views. I could have advised responsible government if I had thought proper, and would have done so if I had thought it desirable for this colony. If anyone believes that the Organic Act does not allow responsible government to be obtained at any time let him move to make clause 19 specially applicable to this colony.

HON DR HELMCKEN—It is in the terms already, only it is not specially named

HON DR CARRALL—Well, name it specially and put it in; I will support it if anyone proposes it. We know what His Excellency's intention is with regard to giving representation in the new Council, but we do not know the measure of it. If there is an overwhelming majority for responsible government in all districts, electors will take care to send responsible government members to the next Council, if the people are determined to have this 'price less boon,' let them send men who will say they will have it. I feel impelled to administer a soft and gentle rebuke to the hon member for New Westminster, who has, I must confess, won my esteem by his manly, straightforward support of these resolutions; but I must take exception to his language, it has been too emphatic—unintentionally of course—because led away by the subject. He has used inflammatory language which he had better not have uttered, language which was not exactly in accordance with what I conceive to be correct. That clause in the Governor's speech which speaks of our not being fit to govern ourselves, Governor Musgrave has never said so; if he had I should have taken it as a personal insult. I say, as a British Columbian, I am capable of governing myself, and if we can individually govern ourselves it is fair to suppose that the colony, as a whole, can govern itself. If you had the whole population comeatable altogether, so that they could be parallel like an army, and you could make them give expression to their views, and out of that get a government, it might be practicable; but instead of that, here we are with a scattered population, isolated centres separated from each other; the majority are here for the sole purpose of making money, and they don't feel that anxiety that has been represented about responsible government; they want to be governed as cheaply as possible. If I am wrong, if it turns out at the polls that even a trifling majority are in favor of responsible government they can have it, the iron heel of Canada is all nonsense. Governor Musgrave is the man we have to deal with, and I say that responsible government is a relief to any Governor, for it comes between him and the people. Governor Musgrave says that it is his (I paraphase) my duty with my experience to give fair and frank advice to the people; to tell them what I think is for their good. If they determine differently to my advice the fault is with them. Supposing that Governor Musgrave had put responsible Government in as a condition, and had thrust it upon the people, would not the respectable minority who are against it have said, or possibly, and as I think probably have said, His Excellency had acted unwisely. This question has been before the people; they would have been justified in jumping at the gilded bait of responsible Government if the Governor had not proposed a new system; but as he has done so the people will do well to consider before they swallow the barbed hook that lies under the bait. I desire to disclaim speaking in the interest of officials their position would, so far as I believe, not be injured in any way by the introduction of responsible Government. Those among them who were commissioned in England (I mean the heads of Departments) will be rendered so independent that they will be above fighting after their own interests. I think it unlikely that they will remain here. As to the balance of officials, if Canada is as liberal now as of old, or as liberal as Australia, they will be well provided for whether we have responsible Government or not. Probably they will be "utilized," since that is the term we are to use. I claim for the system which His Excellency has foreshadowed, that it is more suitable to the present circumstances of this colony than any other system which can be given us. Responsible Government has acted well in large communities, but in small ones I doubt its efficiency. It is like a painted ship on a painted ocean. If it were obtained in a small colony like this, there would be a constant game of battledore and shuttle cock going on—in to day, out to morrow. Fancy the honorable member for Victoria City presiding at the Lands and Works Department one day, and I, having paid him all the compliments I could, come over another day to have an interview with the Chief and find that there has been a change of Ministry, there is another man in. My ideas may be wrong, if so, they can be corrected at the polls. If I were a man of property, with a large stake in the colony, I should decidedly object to responsible Government. I have given my opinion candidly and honestly. I may never sit at this Council Board again. I have given my advice to his Excellency, to this Board, and to my constituents conscientiously. If I am wrong the people will correct me. I speak from conviction. No doubt there is talent in British Columbia; no doubt there is plenty of administrative ability; there are many better men than myself, I am very sure, and that is one reason that I oppose responsible Government. (Laughter.) But the main difficulty is that the best men won't come here; the chaff is blown here, the wheat remains behind.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Drake the debate was adjourned to Monday.

## MONDAY, March 21st, 1870.

Hon MR RING rose to resume the debate, and said; Mr Chairman, I feel assured that the House will accord me leave to say a few words. There have been submitted for the consideration of this House two amendments, and in the observations of the movers two points of argument have been adduced, the first founded on supposed reasoning, and the second in the way of threats and military argument, grounded on the possibility of the government refusing to insert this condition. I desire to disengage myself from this latter argument. When I hear anything tantamount to a threat from the people against the Executive I desire to repudiate it. Hon members who put such a picture of warfare before us talk bunkum. I address my humble petition to His Excellency, but if his judgment is against us, I say to him stand to your point and do not give way to threats; listen to no arguments as to what may happen in the nature of threats; stand to your points. I say to Executive members, don't yield to threats, don't be moved by them. I support the principle of responsible government, but I do so constitutionally. I say to Executive members, I trust you will yield to reason and argument but not to threats. I say we can ask for responsible government without the leave of the Organic Act; but I say let us repudiate all connection with Canada until we have secured responsible government; let us not wait till we are surrounded by Canadians. With regard to the railway, I say that in the life of the youngest amongst us we shall not get it; but we must make this the main resolution, without responsible government let us have no Confederation. Better bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of. Let us not run the risk of having to ask Canada for responsible government. Make it the emphatic SINE QUA NON that we must have responsible government or no Confederation.

Hon MR HUMPHREYS—Out of deference to the amendment offered by the hon member for New Westminster, (Mr Robson,) I ask the leave of the House to withdraw my motion so that the amendment, the latter part of which I like better than my own, may stand.

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL—I regret very much that a discussion so inopposite, so totally unnecessary, should have been forced by the other side of the House at a time so inopportune. I am glad that the hon member for Lillooet has withdrawn his motion; it leaves the Council to deal with the amendment of the hon member for New Westminster, and I deeply regret that the hon gentleman did not accept the invitation to give up a special field-day to the discussion of responsible government, as suggested by myself after we had passed clause 15 of the Terms. This I stated at the time the House was quite competent to do. Then members on this side of the House might have freely joined in the discussion, perhaps some might have supported the principle, but no! The hon proposer of the amendment, with the light of battle in his eye, had refused every suggestion; and afterwards, when he began to find out his mistake, it was too late, there was nothing for it but to go on. The melee had begun; the glove is down; the visors are closed, and the lists barred. It cannot be put off. If the hon member for New Westminster had been opposed to responsible government he could not have devised a course more adapted, than mixing up the question with terms, for shelving responsible government for the session. One point which requires special notice and correction is that nearly all speakers during the debate seem to think that the Governor alone could grant any alteration of Constitution that may be required, merely for the asking, but this is a mistake; he cannot. The Constitution can only be changed by the same power that created it—the Imperial Parliament and the Queen in Council. The Governor can only recommend. It is for the Home Government to say what that change shall be. As to the able speech of the hon member for New Westminster, the eloquence of which I was forced to applaud in spite of myself, it was an argument based upon fallacious premises throughout, asserting that we should only have a representative majority of one, which could only lead to a false conclusion, and I take it that the hon member is in favor of responsible government as a SINE QUA NON, else why all this tall talking of blood, wading knee deep in blood, why this encouragement of rebellion, in defence of our rights and the like, and yet I understood the hon member for New Westminster to say that he does not make responsible government a SINE QUA NON for Confederation.

Hon MR ROBSON—I said nothing of the kind. I do not choose to state whether or not I would make it a SINE QUA NON.

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL—I have an accurate recollection, and have a note of it, and I ask the hon member to state whether he will make it a SINE QUA NON.

Hon CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I understood the hon member for New Westminster to say that Confederation would not be satisfactory to the colony without responsible government, but that he would not pledge himself to make it a SINE QUA NON.

Hon MR ROBSON—I said further that I did not pledge myself that the people would not.

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL—I then understand that the honorable member for New Westminster puts it not as a sine qua non.

Hon MR ROBSON—No, Mr. Chairman, I never said that. I will not be placed in such a position. I refuse to have such an issue forced upon us.

ATTORNEY GENERAL—Either the honorable member puts it one way or the other; one of two opposites must be true. I can quite understand, and must prefer the direct and simple issue of the honorable member for Victoria District, for immediate responsible Government in any case, either with or without confederation. I say, sir, that the question is in no way connected with the discussion of this clause.

I said that responsible Government ought not to be considered until after the Council is reconstituted with an increased representation, as shadowed forth in his Excellency's speech. I have said that we shall have the sole control of the matter in our own hands if we have confederation. I say we, because I identify myself with this country. I speak on this matter as a citizen. I say that if we have confederation we shall have an opportunity of getting responsible Government. If we have not Confederation then we shall have increased representation, and under that we can get responsible Government if the country as a unit goes for it. Honorable members are complicating this question. I cannot imagine that it was the intention of the honorable member for New Westminster to complicate the question. I have too much respect for him to allow myself to suppose so, it is impossible, and that he wished to force a negative, is equally impossible. It is an error of judgment in my opinion. If it had been left to the Council separately it would have left honorable members more at liberty to consider the question freely. I was, in common with other members carried away in admiration of the outburst of oratory of the honorable member. But there was an allusion—a warning. It is said that it was not a threat; but there was talk of shouldering muskets, and of blood and bloodshed, and that was the proper way to get civil rights. I protest against these threats, these turgid speeches which oppress the ears of those who wish to listen to argument and reason. As to the opposition of the Government members it arises from no dislike to the system on the part of the head of the Executive. Responsible Government interposes a barrier between the people and the Governor, which is most useful to the Governor. I say that we are not in a position to take advantage of responsible Government. If the country thinks it necessary or desirable what is there to prevent our getting it when we choose to ask for it. The honorable member for New Westminster himself told us that the Imperial Government were always ready to step in, and yet he hints at violence and disturbance. When the honorable Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works proposed a resolution last session, which was seconded by myself with respect to a change in the Constitution, asking for a Council with a majority of one of representative members, honorable members said we don't want the change, and voted it down. If we had secured this we should have been a step further in advance than we are in constitutional progress. I say we must hesitate before any body constituted as this Council is, can pass resolutions of such a nature. Any such resolutions ought to express the full and deliberate opinions of the country. As to the special merits of responsible Government itself, it is hardly necessary to argue it here at such an inopportune time. I shall therefore merely

say that I think it totally inapplicable at present to the circumstances of British Columbia, where population is so sparse, and lies at the circumference of a circle which contains an area of 300,000 square miles, and where representation is so difficult that the form suggested would be the most expensive that could be adopted, and instead of preventing agitation will be likely to increase it. Much of the population is alien, and in any case this Council is not the proper body to pass upon it. If, however, the country is of a different opinion they can say so at the polls, and there is no power can prevent their getting responsible Government. But I would ask what makes the system so particularly attractive to honorable members who advocate it? We are told that it is solely, because it will be good for the colony, but there is no attempt to prove the proposition that has been set up. Another thing strikes me as coming with a very bad grace from those who support this recommendation. It presupposes a distrust of Canada, and assumes that men of the large experience of Canadian Statesmen, and so reliable as they are, are not to be trusted to yield to a general cry from the country for enlarged representative institutions. I don't think that this is the time to go into the question. I say, then, that whenever responsible Government is wanted it can be had. I need hardly refer to the position of official members in this matter. The terms already passed by the House so far as this question is in any way connected with Confederation, leave the officials free to express their opinions. I must, myself, vote against this recommendation, and I press upon the honorable members to do the same in order to prevent the complication of the terms with any such irrelevant question.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I must endeavor in as few words as possible to state the position of the Government members upon the subject now before the House. I fully understand that it was imperative upon some hon members to bring forward this question of responsibility at some period of the present session, having advocated it by speech and pen as the specific remedy for the ills that the colony was laboring under. Consistency demanded that the question should be brought up by them for discussion; it was a logical necessity. Inexorable fate, I say, impelled certain hon members to advocate responsible government. I had, however, hoped that the hon members who advocated it would have reserved it for separate consideration, instead of bringing it up as an amendment to this clause now under consideration. (Mr Robson—no, not an amendment.) Virtually it is an amendment. If this clause had prescribed that any future alteration in the constitution should have been dependent on Canada, then I could see the desirability of hon members on the other side of the House taking exception to it; but as it is I confess I am at a loss to comprehend their position. Although, as I said inexorable fate compelled hon members to bring the subject forward, it is a mistake to bring it up in a Council constituted as this is, especially when the Governor has so distinctly expressed his views in opposition to the inauguration of responsible government at the present time. It would surely have been much more to the advantage of the cause they advocate for hon members to have postponed the consideration of the question for the more representative House shadowed forth in His Excellency's speech. I say shadowed forth, for on reflection it must be plain to all hon members that His Excellency was not in a position to tell what the constitution of that House will be. He does not know. He has recommended certain changes for Imperial sanction; they may or may not be favorably considered. His Excellency does, however, tell you that the representative element will be larger, and I think, therefore, that it would have been wiser on the part of the representative members who advocate responsible government to have left it to the next Council instead of bringing it forward while the present resolutions are under discussion. The subject, if not positively irrelevant, is not connected with this resolution, which simply provides, as a matter of form, power to change the constitution, in accordance with the Organic Act, when the people desire it. In common with the hon Attorney General, I am surprised that hon members who cordially support Confederation should be afraid to trust the Dominion Government upon this question. I am surprised at the inconsistency of those who tell you that the people could not get responsible government under Confederation, and that the wishes of the people would not be allowed to prevail. I am surprised particularly at the hon member for New Westminster expressing any doubt upon this subject. I, as an individual member of this community, would willingly leave the interests of the colony to the guardianship of the Canadian Government. If I did not think that that Government would exercise whatever power it might have for the benefit of the people, instead of, as suggested by hon members, for its own aggrandisement, I would have no Confederation. If under Confederation there would be no chance of responsible government, how can the hon member expect to get it from a Council constituted as this is? However, as the subject has been brought forward for discussion, it behoves us to consider it upon its merits. There were two propositions before the House. The hon member for Lillooet has withdrawn his, which was in reality but a vague expression of an abstract opinion in favor of responsible government, a recommendation in general terms. We have now to confine our attention to the amendment of the hon member for New Westminster; the preamble of which states that Confederation will not be satisfactory to the people without responsible government. The resolution itself although embodying the same principle as the one which has been withdrawn, contemplates a practical step towards obtaining the object recommended, by addressing the Governor. The hon member for New Westminster was careful to reserve his own opinion, but he was very positive that Confederation without responsible government would not be acceptable to the people. Coming now to the subject and matter of the speeches of the two hon members, I find that the arguments of the hon member for Lillooet are simply invectives, his entire logic is abuse of the Government and the persons composing it. I have always understood that assertion is not fact, and that invective is not argument. It may be that my inability to appreciate the force of his remarks arises from my not possessing the qualification which he told us was essential to a proper understanding of the people and the people's affairs. It may be that I have not 'eaten and drunk and slept with the people,' and cannot, therefore, rightly estimate the strength of demonstration which general and indiscriminate abuse of government officials may convey to some minds. As to the hon member's earnestness of belief in his case, his conscientiousness in the discharge of his duty to his constituents and to the colony, had we ever had any doubt of it, his positive and repeated assurances of the honesty of his intentions in this matter, of his unfaltering determination to do his duty to those he represents, must have forced conviction upon us. But, while giving him full credit for singleness of purpose, I must take leave to remark on his singular mode of recommending the subject to the favorable consideration of this Council, since his argument in its favor is to heap general accusation and vituperation on the official members of this Council, whom he invites to join with him by voting in favor of his views, to confirm his view of their utter baseness and worthlessness. I shall not place myself in opposition to such a line of argument. But, sir, the argument of the hon member for New Westminster is of a very different character. I congratulate him and I congratulate the House on the manner in which the matter was treated by him, and especially as regards the officials. I acknowledge the courteous manner in which he touched on these points in his arguments which affected the members at this end of the table. It is inseparable from the discussion of this question in this House that it must to some extent partake of a personal character, it must almost mean a vote of want of confidence in Government officials. The smallness of the community reduces it almost to a question amongst individuals, and as the Government members have been placed, unnecessarily and inexpediently, as I think, to some extent upon their defence, I must speak plainly on some points, but in doing so I must deprecate any idea of giving offence. I say, then, that responsible government is not desirable, and is not applicable to this colony at present, is practicably unworkable. And here I would deprecate the impression which is being so studiously instilled into the people of this colony concerning what has been said of the unfitness of the colony for responsible government. His Excellency the Governor has never said, nor has any member of the Government ever said that the people are unfit, individually, to govern themselves. I say that, man for man, this community will compare favorably with any people on this coast. (Hear, hear, from the Attorney General.) Nor is it even the smallness of the population that I consider to be the great objection, although I admit that this is a drawback; but it is the scattered character of that population. It would be practically impossible to organise electoral districts so that they should properly represent the interests of the separate parts, and of the whole colony. As Victoria is the centre of wealth, and intelligence also if you will, under present circumstances the government would be centralized in the hands of Victorians, who would thus rule the colony, and this would be objectionable (hear, hear, from Mr Holbrook,) and I say also that there would be a great difficulty in getting proper representatives to represent the respective districts. I do not agree with the hon member who has stated that only the chaff of the people is blown into this House for I say, sir, that this Council, constituted as it is, has proved that men fit to represent the people do come here. Responsible government will come as a matter of course when the community is fit for it, but that form of government is not fitted for communities in their infancy. It has never been so considered. Look abroad into the world and you will find large populations without responsible government. There is no necessity to look far off to see whether the Anglo-Saxon race must necessarily have responsible government. Look across the straits, where there is a population of, I suppose, 30,000 people, and there they have neither responsible government nor representative institutions. Look at Oregon, also with no representation until the population exceeded 45,000. Look at the Red River Settlement, also with a population larger than ours, they do not apply for responsible government. It does not follow according to the rule of Anglo-Saxon minds that this form of government must prevail. I do not think the sort of responsibility which is advocated would be suitable to this colony at present, or would promote its true interests. If I did think it desirable I should be found amongst its most cordial advocates, as this is a matter open for discussion without Government direction. But I think, sir, that our present form of Government is practically a more real responsibility to the people than that proposed by the hon member for New Westminster, this form which the hon member for Lillooet finds it so easy to animadvert upon. For we are in reality if not directly responsible to the people. We, as servants of the Crown, are directly and immediately responsible to the Governor, and the Governor is responsible to the Queen, who is the guardian of the people's rights. This is no mere idea, for the fact of responsibility has been, over and over again, proved. If you have any good grounds of complaint you know where to lay them and get redress. This responsibility which we owe is more real, less fluctuating, less open to doubtful influences, and under it the rights of the whole country are secured and protected, and not those of the majority to the prejudice of the minority, as under the so called responsible government, which really means party government, advocated so warmly by the hon member for New Westminster. Why, sir, the hon member has admitted to you that under that system the government of the day might come down to pass measures by unfair means.

Hon Mr Robson—No, I made use of no such words; what were my words?

Hon Mr Trutch—The hon member said, and I took down his words, that under responsible government 'the government might come down to the House and carry measures by means not excessively fair.' I say that this cannot occur under the present system, that no corruption can be charged against this government. I think the House is capable of being remodelled. I would rather see a larger element of representative government in this Council with such a majority that the government would have no opportunity of passing a measure objectionable to the people, as understood by their representatives; such a majority as I advocated in a resolution submitted to this Council. But the hon members for New Westminster, for Victoria District, and for Lillooet, tell you that the people desire responsible government, that they must have it and will have it. I say, sir, that if they do say so, which I very much doubt, it is because the population have been educated up to it by those who have agitated the subject through the Press and through speeches; some no doubt press for it from conviction and some with a view to serving their own ends, but I believe, sir, that what the people really want is such an administration of the government as will tend to bring back prosperity to the colony. You are told that the present officials have no sympathy with the people, that they are not of the people, that they move in a different sphere, and constitute a class by themselves. Is this true—or is it not rather the fact that persons who have ends to serve have put us in a class by ourselves? The hon member says that the hands of the benefactors of the people must be callous with labor. Who, I ask, are those throughout the world who have labored most for the people by speech and pen? I say that the great statesmen who have done most to advance the truest interests of the people, have not sprung from the ranks of those whom the hon member classes as the people. The hon member for New Westminster says that the present government officials are well enough, able and honest but that they cannot enjoy the confidence of the people because they are not THEIR officials, they are not elected by them. And, be as able as we might, and as honest and work

as we might, and do what we might for the people's good we could not gain their confidence because we are not directly responsible to them. And the hon member sympathized with us for the position! Now, sir, if it be true, as he says, that the government have not the confidence of the community when, he says, they deserve it, whose is the fault? I say, sir, it is the fault of those who, by voice and pen, have for years sedulously prejudiced the public mind of this community against that government, not by pointing out faults to be remedied but by general and indiscriminate fault finding, descending to personal abuse, and even to the verge of scurrility. We have striven to do our duty. Hon members do not advance arguments but content themselves with saying that we are unpopular. I tell you why; if false impressions have gone abroad on this point let the responsibility of those impressions rest where it ought, for I say that it has been the business of certain persons to prejudice the public mind against government officials; let them settle the question of motives with their own consciences and with the people. If the officials in this House occupied the positions which would be held by officials under party government, I could understand the persistent course of opposition offered by some members present; but when I see the changed position, that there is no responsible government, and that our mouths are closed and our pens cannot be used in self defence, I feel that we have been struck in a cowardly manner, and let the public defend the motives of those who have attacked us. I invite all in this House or out of it to aid us to carry out the government, and to act in a reasonable way in promoting the general interests of the colony. Whether we are to have responsible government or not I don't know. I feel that it will come in good time, when the circumstances of the colony are so changed as to admit of its adoption—I think sooner with Confederation than without it—but whether we have it or not, I ask hon members to assist us instead of endeavoring to complicate matters and retard the progress of the colony. I ask them to give us some credit for good intentions. Now, sir, one remark in conclusion: the hon member for New Westminster, in his powerful oration has not only allured us with the prospects of popularity under responsible government but he has, I will not say threatened, but warned us of the result of our opposing him in this matter. He tells us that unless responsible government be conceded the cause of Confederation will be ruined, that the people would not have Confederation without responsible government, this in fact is embodied in the preamble of his resolution. Sir, I have cordially supported Confederation because I honestly believe that it will be for the benefit of the local interests of this community as well as for the security and consolidation of imperial interests; but I believe that this community is not ready for responsible government; I will not therefore do what I consider wrong that good may come; I will not vote for responsible government for the sake of gaining Confederation. I, for one, say, if the people won't have Confederation without responsible government, if they regard responsible government as the main object of Confederation, if they do not appreciate the real advantages of Confederation, let Confederation wait a while. The Governor has sent down resolutions which he thinks can be carried out, and we hold that whether under Confederation or not, this matter of responsible government will ultimately have to be settled by the vote of the people. When the proper time comes we shall, I say, as a matter of course, have responsible government, and that time will arrive sooner under Confederation than without it. I trust the Dominion Government; I do not think they will go against the will of the people. I believe that in this, as in other matters, if they exercise influence at all it will be for the good of the country. A government of liberal institutions cannot be expected to oppose the wishes of the people in proper and reasonable matters. Responsible government ought not to be a condition of Confederation, and I say that in these resolutions it is very properly left to be settled in a new and more fully representative Council which the Governor has told us he is going to obtain imperial sanction to establish. But if Confederation is to depend on this question of responsible government then I say let it be the test also of the reality of the supporters of Confederation.

Hon Mr Robson—I expect the privilege of a general reply, but I desire to explain, now, that the Hon. Chief Commissioner has made an unfair use of what I said about "horny hands and patched garments." I disclaim having used it in that connection attributed to me, his remarks are unfair.

Hon Mr Walkem—I think on an important question of this kind every member should give a reason for his vote. I have given the matter great consideration, and had intended entering somewhat fully into the discussion, but the Hon. Chief Commissioner has anticipated me. I have been utterly astonished as I listened to what fell from him. I entirely coincide with him in his argument and in his views. Indeed, I can hardly help thinking that either he has copied my notes or his. I must congratulate myself on coming to this conclusion. On the same grounds I congratulate the House on the good temper, good taste intelligence and ability with which this question has been launched for discussion. The main speech for the honorable member for Victoria District did not deign to express his views, has been that of the honorable member for New Westminster. As I listened to that speech, sir, one of the best ever uttered in this House, I almost felt that for five long years I had been wrong, he almost made a convert of me, but upon looking a little more closely into it, I find that it is based upon false premises; his arguments are fallacious, and his conclusions wrong. The honorable member says that responsible Government is a principle which may be applied either to the Great Eastern or to a dairy churn, or to a lady's watch; that it is a principle capable of being carried out by three, or three hundred. This is utterly incorrect; it is not a principle but a form, one element of which is responsibility to the people. It is a form adopted by the people but it does not follow as a matter of induction that it can be used or carried out in every place or by every community. In 1837 the rebellion in Canada for the purpose of acquiring responsible Government took place. The rebellion was raised and the question agitated simply for changing the form of Government. What was the population? It was in the neighborhood of 2,000,000 in 1837, and of 2,500,000 in 1861. Look at the difference of the population of this colony, after deducting the aliens and females, there is scarcely a voting population through the whole colony of 3,000. Have the whole country mapped out and show me how much further the Governor can go in usefully extending the representation. We have nine members, and out of these nine, under responsible Government, we should have to elect a Colonial Secretary, an Attorney General, a Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, and probably two other Cabinet Ministers, altogether five in office and four struggling for power. Make the whole number eighteen and you then have a constant struggle for power, a struggle such as we have not had in this colony before, and such as I hope we shall not see. There are virtually two ends of the colony which represent all the wealth and property of the community, Victoria and Cariboo. Cariboo would be contending for the repeal of road tolls, and Victoria would be contending that they ought to be paid. It may be said that these general questions of taxation will be left to the Dominion Government, but there are many other subjects which will create differences between the two ends of the colony. The honorable member for New Westminster says if we go in without responsible Government we shall go in with agitation. Does any one believe that if we had responsible Government to-morrow, politicians will have no subject on which to agitate. Political agitation will never cease. Let us go further. As the honorable Chief Commissioner says we have the United States advocating responsible Government, and that form of it which is said to be the best in theory, a form in reality democratic, but the people are not educated to the extent of the principle itself. Americans are averse not only to granting small but large territories, the freedom which we now ask. They say, 'You shall be a Territory until you are properly educated.' For instance, there is Washington Territory, with a population of 27,000, sends a Delegate to Congress, who has no vote. Dacota, another Territory has been refused admission as a State until it has a population larger than it now possesses. I am just reminded about Alaska, which is not even a territory yet. General Thomas reported against giving it any other than a military form of Government. How can we then expect responsible Government with our population. I know that there are honorable members wavering, their interests tell them to vote one way, their conscience points to another. I say, vote according to your conscience. I say that a village can never have responsible Government. I maintain that it would prove a curse through the agitation that would follow instead of a blessing. I coincide with the honorable member for New Westminster as to what he says as to callous hands. I believe there are men with tattered garments in the upper country quite capable of giving a sensible vote upon all questions likely to come before a Council in this colony, but we find that they have too much to do, they have no time for politics, they have to earn their own bread. I believe that the honorable member for Cariboo has uttered the true sentiments of the great majority of the district. I do not believe that Cariboo is favorable to responsible Government. These gentlemen with the patched garments and callous hands have the same opportunity that the member for New Westminster has had of coming into the House. He has told us with pride of his hard work as a pioneer on the Fraser river, and to-day we hear him advocating with most eloquent language, his views upon this great question. His voice has had much to do with shaping the councils of this House, and I ask, are these doors shut to any man in the colony of equal talent with the honorable gentleman who can be found willing to devote their time to the service of their country? I do not feel in the servile position of being obliged to vote one way or the other. I am as free to vote as the honorable member himself. I shall give my vote to the best of my ability. I believe that no compulsion has been brought to bear upon any member of this House, official or otherwise. The latter part of the speech of the honorable gentleman (Mr Robson) is hardly worthy of the former, it contains language which I am very sorry he has used, language which makes me believe that it is not from conviction, but that it is intended to go forth to the world to stir up the people; excellent stump oratory, if, without intending the slightest disrespect I may use the term. I believe it is not the wish of the property owners of Victoria to have responsible Government. Do you suppose, sir that property owners are going, willingly, to intrust their interests to persons of whom they know nothing? I do not decry professional politicians, I believe they are as useful as any other professional men in their way, but I say, as a fact, there are no politicians here with the exception of those who have devoted their time to politics. Why, I ask, is there so great an antipathy to leaving this question for the people to decide at the polls? "Give us," says the other side, "an opportunity of educating ourselves, so that our mistakes, when made, may be remedied." I say that there is no better education than this Council in which honorable members have education before they come to responsible Government, for under the scheme foreshadowed by the Governor, the position will be very little inferior to responsible Government. Depend upon it, if the Canadian Government think we can manage responsible Government they will give it to us, they will be glad to get rid of the question. I say, however, this question is being agitated at an inopportune time. I, for one would not consent to trust my interests to any such change. I do not believe in the present form of Government, but if the form foreshadowed by the Governor be carried out, it will give the people a system very little inferior, as I have said, to responsible Government, and infinitely more workable. I trust that honorable members will give due weight to the remarks of other speakers who have preceded me upon this question, and will well consider their votes.

Hon Mr Drake—Mr Chairman, I have a strong objection to this clause being inserted; it never ought to have been in the terms. It presumes that this colony is willing to go into Confederation with the form of Government that we have at present; it seems to have been put in as a sop to Canada; it ought to have been left out. I cannot see why it was inserted, or what advantage it can possibly be to us. If we go into Confederation bound hand and foot with the same form of government as now, we shall have no power to change the form. We shall then have Canada as a Queen Regnant; we shall then have an Executive who will if so directed, vote against responsible government. This colony would be a preserve for Canadian statesmen and Canadian patronage; we shall be no more advanced then than now. Without going into argument I may be pardoned, I trust, if I quote three propositions of John Stuart Mill on responsible government. First, 'Do the people require it; or are they unwilling to accept it?' We are told that this has not been made a question; I deny this statement. It has been made a question, more or less, in Victoria at every election; every election depends more or less on this point. Second, 'Are the people willing to take the burdens which are imposed on them by such a form?' I say that we have the answer to this proposition in the fact of there being people willing to come here where they are practically useless. Do not persons come forward to represent the people? A very large majority of the people take part in every election. Third, 'Are the people willing and able to do that which will enable the government to perform its functions properly?' This I contend is the condition of the colony. The main argument of the Chief Commissioner in his very able speech, a broad argument and very well put is that the population is scattered. I say this argument cannot be used with effect. We are told that the Government would fall into the hands of Victoria as the centre of population and wealth; no great harm if it did. Victoria is dependent upon all parts of the colony and they on her; the interests are identical. Another objection that has been raised is that we cannot get men of proper intelligence and qualifications for

positions of honor and trust. Looking round this council board we see men who have come out to this colony to make their own fortunes and homes; out of them the present members of the Government have been chosen, and out of our present population there can be found an equal number of men who can properly fulfil the duties of the Government. I cannot see that it is impossible to find proper men. If we find men willing to sit in this Council now we shall find plenty ready and anxious to share in the burdens of responsible government. The sufficiency or insufficiency of population is not an element in this question. The United States has been pointed out to us as an example. I say there is no responsible government in the United States, it is an absolute despotic democracy, absolutely irresponsible to the people except once in four years. There is no such thing as responsibility in the form of government of the United States, the only means of getting rid of a minister is by impeachment. The hon member for Cariboo, in his rambling speech, gives us no new argument against responsible government; he certainly reiterated much that was forcibly put forward by the hon Chief Commissioner. I can well believe that the wheat was left at Cariboo and the chaff came here.

Hon Mr Humphreys—Sir, I have listened to the speeches of the hon Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works and to the hon Government Nominee, and I find them difficult to answer because there is so little in them; the only way would be to have them printed and read them. they carry their answers with them. One hon member says that it rests on numbers; I say that intelligence is the only qualification for responsible government, numbers have nothing to do with it. If I err I am proud in erring with some of the greatest men that England ever produced. The hon Chief Commissioner has admitted that the population, taken man for man, is equal to that of any country. Then I say we have the proper qualification; let us have practical and not theoretical means of governing. What is really the case? Under the present form of government the people have to pay for the privilege and benefit of a few gentlemen sitting round this board. Take away this form of government and make it more liberal, and what is the danger? All the civil wars and troubles have not arisen from the uneducated, but from the ambition of the so called educated classes. The people have been the Conservatives who came forward to keep the country going; take away the so-called intelligent and educated classes and it will be no great loss, the laboring classes can always supply men to fill their places; but take away the working classes and you kill the world, the educated classes cannot fill their places. In my opinion, sir, the people want practical reality. They have endured too long the law's delay and the insolence of those in office. Why should we come here, year after year, to ask for a change in the form of Government? I think that responsible government should be a SINE QUA NON of Confederation. I shall move an amendment to that effect.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Great heavens! what terrible things are said and done in the name of the people. To hear hon members talk one would think that they were the people, but the people are quiet while hon members are very loud. I intend to support the Government; I do not mean to say much for or against. I take the position that the people can have responsible government when they want it, and their representatives ought to be satisfied to take it when the people really and seriously ask for it. Responsible government has been one of the watchwords of a certain set of politicians who wanted to bring on Confederation, government of from for and by the people, without regard to the material interests of the Colony—this means government by politicians. These gentlemen will sacrifice every benefit to the Colony for responsible government. Confederation to me means terms; to them it means pickings, office, place and power. This will be represented I am well aware, as being the result of being in the Executive Council; it is said that there is a great difference between the atmosphere of the two Councils, I acknowledge it. There with closed doors people speak the truth without any AD CAPTANDUM arguments addressed to the galleries; there people can state what their opinions really are; here popularity has to be sought. We are told that the people will fight for responsible Government. That is mere nothing—words only. The honorable member for New Westminster in his able speech erected a very handsome structure, but like most fancy structures, it will be a very expensive one. He wants a Government like Ontario, that is a Government of one House, with eighty members. For a Government of that kind not less than forty or fifty would be absolutely necessary.

Hon Mr Robson—I never said like that of Ontario, but that we wanted the principle of responsible Government as existing in Ontario.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Then why not bring in a scheme embodying it? The true principles of responsible Government can only exist satisfactorily with forty or fifty members in the House. It would cost very little short of $20 000 per annum. That out of the very small amount we are to get from Canada would reduce the amount likely to be available for public works to a fraction. You must have a large number to work responsible Government, or more properly speaking, party Government. If we are to have it, I would not have the heads of Departments responsible to the people, at least not the working heads; if any head of a Department is to be responsible to the people, let it be the political head; but I would make the working heads of Departments permanent. I have found from my experience of the old Vancouver Island House of Assembly, that policy frequently changes and turns round. The same thing would happen under responsible Government. If I wished to oppose Confederation I believe that I could not do a better thing towards effecting my object than to vote for responsible Government, but I want to see the more material wants advanced by Confederation. I know that material interests were not the pivot, but that it was place, patronage and office that was wanted. With regard to the present system of Government, it is very easy to say that it is bad, but I have listened to all the speeches and have not heard one word of practical fault-finding with the present government—merely the assumption that the people desire change. This desire for change they have been educated to. I acknowledge many faults in the past, but we have now a new Executive, and we are promised a change in the form of government; but this is apart from Confederation altogether. It appears to me that the first thing we have to arrange is the money question, to get our material interests first settled, to make sure that this colony should be pecuniarily better off, to make the question of Confederation now turn upon material interest and not allow our material interests to be jeopardized by a cry for responsible government, not to allow responsible government to be the sauce to make the public swallow bad and unprofitable terms. All members have acknowledged that 'money' is the basis of all governments; let us get that money. I would not have the public vote for responsible government and forget or put in the background, the money. Place the question upon material terms and the colony will demand profitable terms; but mix it up with responsible government and you get a divided opinion upon it, and those who think responsible government everything will vote for that to the exclusion of any terms, or, at all events, with unprofitable terms. There are doubtless, many who hope to live upon responsible government, but, sir, responsible government is not food and raiment. The people can live without responsible government but they cannot live upon it. Give them food and raiment first, the rest will follow in natural succession. These few words will give you my reasons for consenting to the arrangement proposed in the conditions. More than this, I am not pledged to responsible government, but I am pledged to representative institutions. The latter have been granted. My mission thus far is fulfilled. I have always asserted that we must take our steps to responsible government gradually. Having representative institutions, we can go on to the other. No one ever stated that the people were unfit to govern themselves, all acknowledge that they have talent enough, but this I do assert, that thus far the people have shown an unwillingness to govern themselves—have taken but little interest in the matter. It is not that they are unfit, but unwilling; they prefer looking after their own business, it pays them better. I need not refer to the difficulty of getting members, and doubtless some of us sit here from that cause, and it is no doubt true as has been said that better could have been found outside. If you have responsible government it will fall into the hands of those who wish to make a living by it. No one has said that it would be economical—it would not be so. It would require at least thirty members to carry on party government, for six weeks at least every year, or $150 per diem for 36 days, which would amount to $5400 and then the mileage would come to as much more, say, altogether $10 000. Add to these the salaries of the political heads, say five at $2,000 per annum, and then you have the nice little sum of $20,000 a year. Then, I suppose, each Minister would require a pension when he went out. The real executive officers would remain then as now, and would have to be paid nearly as much as at present. The truth is there would be a great difficulty in getting members, and without a large body of members it could not be carried on. You would find that the best men would avoid politics, and soon there would be very great corruption. There is a great deal of talk about voting away the people's money, but it must be borne in mind that a part of that money, under Confederation will come from Canada, and she will have a right to see it properly expended. There is also a great deal of talk about hon official members voting their own salaries, but would not the same thing be done under responsible government? Have not hon representative members voted themselves salaries this present session? Hon members say that if responsible government is not granted we will agitate. I thought that everybody was so much in favor of it that the people would rise, if it were not included in the terms, that there would be employment for every gunsmith in Victoria; and yet we are told "we will agitate."

Hon Mr Robson—I never said that; I said that the people would agitate.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is much the same thing, the agitators will beat the bush once more, and they will perhaps be driving the birds for other people once again, if the people really desire responsible government. Why is there any necessity for all this agitation? I admit that many of the people of Victoria desire it, and think that it can be carried out. Ask the scattered districts in the country and they will tell you that they do not know or care about it, political opinion does not run high in the colony. I intend to support the government upon this clause, but I leave myself perfectly free to vote for responsible government if I think proper. I want to secure the material interests of the colony. Let the people say whether those material interests will be benefitted by Confederation, but not mix up the question of responsible government with it. I am perfectly willing to abide by the decision of the people on responsible government, and on Confederation on Terms, separately. My sole desire is to see this country materially benefitted; if the people want responsibility I will not say nay, but we must have good terms. At the polls responsible government might carry Confederation with very insufficient terms. I am perfectly certain that the Government have acted wisely in not allowing the terms to be clogged with responsible government. I say don't let responsible government take the place of material benefits.

Hon Dr Carrall—Sir—I rise to take exception to what the hon and learned member for Victoria City said about being bound hand and foot to Canada. In my remarks he can find no efforts to catch votes, and no clap trap addressed to the galleries, but I advocate what may be unpopular from conviction.

Hon Mr Barnard—Sir—I agree with the hon Chief Commissioner that it is a pity that this question has been brought up now, for I had made up my mind to vote for responsible government in its entirety, but the hon member for New Westminster put the question to the hon Attorney-General, who said it must go on.

Hon Attorney General—I said that as the hon member for New Westminster and others insisted upon opening the discussion it must go on.

Hon Mr Robson—I felt regret that it should be brought up now, but when I asked if we could put it off the hon Attorney General said it was too late.

Hon Attorney General—I offered the hon members for New Westminster and Lillooet every opportunity for discussing this important question upon a day to be set apart for the purpose.

Hon Mr Humphreys—What I did was in consequence of what the hon Attorney General said at the commencement of the debate; he invited recommendations, otherwise I should not have put my notice on the board.

Hon Mr Barnard—It was fully impressed on my mind that this question should not be mixed up with the terms. I am astonished at the charge against representative members of trying to force this question upon the House at an inopportune time. I will leave it to the government to say whether it shall be left for another day or go on.

Hon Attorney General—I say, again, now the debate has begun, now the gauntlet is down, the debate must go on.

Hon Mr Robson—Sir, this course is most unfair on the part of the government members. Let the House decide whether it will go on with this question now or postpone it. It seems to me that the hon Attorney General is resorting to a parliamentary manoeuvre in forcing this matter on. It is a matter that representative members only ought to vote on. We shall have a large majority of representative members on this question and that is all we want. I say that the Attorney General did not fairly answer my question as to whether, by passing this resolution, we should shut the door to further discussion of the question during the present session.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I should now object to the resolution being withdrawn, as the question has been discussed let us take a decision upon it, it would be unwise to postpone the question.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I think, sir, the matter cannot now be postponed, let us fight it out and have done with it.

Hon Mr Robson—I say, sir, that this debate may be postponed, and if the government vote is given against the postponement we shall know the reason.

Hon Mr Barnard—The hon Chief Commissioner said that he should take an adverse vote on this resolution as a vote of want of confidence. I don't want that. Won't hon government members help us?

Hon Dr Carrall—The opposition say that the government ought not to have put such a resolution on the terms, let us take that issue.

Hon Mr Barnard—It was not my desire to hamper the government; I desired to give a hearty support to the government, and, at the same time, to do my duty to my constituents. I have never felt the weight of responsibility as I feel it to day: I feel that I am about casting a vote which will affect for weal or woe the destiny of this fine Province. I am convinced that if a majority of the elected members of this Council vote 'aye' to day on this question, responsible government will be inaugurated conjointly with Confederation. It is beyond a question that the intelligent portion of the community are in favor of responsible government, but there is a grave question in regard to its adaptation to the colony. The words coming from His Excellency are worthy of careful consideration. They contain strong reasons against the introduction of responsible government. Public opinion is not settled on the Island. The hon senior member for Victoria city has shown in his remarks that there is a great want of settled principle in the colony. The principal men of Victoria are averse to taking upon themselves the duties and labor of legislating for the country. Men of standing and wealth stand aloof. The merchants, manufacturers and professional men take no interest in the matter of legislation. There is a great difficulty in getting good representative men. There are, I admit, many good reasons which might be urged against the measure, and I have no doubt that dissatisfaction, to some extent may ensue. I agree with the Commissioner of Lands and Works, in his remarks about the press influencing the public unfavorably to the government, but the blame is not in the press but in that system of government which keeps the rulers silent. The members of the government ought to be in a position to defend themselves both by pen and speech. I have glanced at a few reasons against the admission of responsible government, but I will now look at the other side. Look at the fact of all the larger subjects, under union, being dealt with by the Federal power. This fact of itself is as strong an argument as we need. What hon member can go to his constituents and tell them that he thinks the local business of this colony could be managed better at Ottawa than it can be by ourselves? The official members of this government will no doubt avail themselves of the retiring pension, and appointees from Ottawa will take their places. Will those latter officials have to be pensioned off by this colony when we adopt responsible government? This is a strong objection to entering the union under a system like the present. This colony may be asked to pension another set of officials. Will the people be satisfied with this sort of government if we are to have appointees from Ottawa? There are a class of men who oppose Confederation on this ground. They would prefer remaining as they are, with the officials nominated from Downing-street, rather than from Ottawa. It is often asserted that this colony is not ready. How long are we to wait? Canada was told the same story when she had a population of 600,000. All the other Provinces were told the same thing. Must we wait for such an increase, or must we fight as did Canada? Throw us on our own resources as a colony and we will soon learn valuable lessons in the science of government. There were gentlemen of good families and of good education, who came here in early days, who had never suffered privations of any sort before they came here; sent out to make fortunes, or, at all events, homes for themselves; their roughing it was rough indeed. Bad news had come from the mines, the avenues of trade were closed, there were no agricultural pursuits for them to turn to, the consequence was that they had to lie round hotels; after failing to get government employment, for which, as a matter of course, they applied, some kept bars whilst waiting for remittances. The reason was that they never had been taught self-reliance; we shall be in the same position if we are constantly to have rulers from England, or Canada, but throw us on our own resources and we shall succeed. Self-reliance is the best means of education in politics as in anything else. If our rulers are sent us from England or Ottawa we will always lack self-reliance. Self-reliance is written on every line of the British North American Act. Rely upon yourselves, is the cry of the people of England. It is better to grapple with the difficulties now when the issues are small and comparatively unimportant, and should we make blunders they will not be so serious when our interests are small; and for what errors we do commit, the consequences will fall upon ourselves. We will, no doubt, blunder at first, and there may be chaff blown here. If responsible government will bring the scum to the top, dross will go to the bottom. The scum will be ladled off—the chaff will be blown away by the breath of public opinion. The Governor's promise of a majority will not satisfy the people, and we should therefore urge upon His Excellency to give us responsible government. I am not in favor, however, of making that condition a SINE QUA NON of Confederation. I would accept Confederation with good terms, even without responsible government. There may be a few arguments against it, but there are many in its favor. Under no circumstances would I like Confederation and responsible government to go to the polls together. I hope the people will sever the two. Let us have Confederation and we shall get responsible government.

Hon Mr Wood—In rising to address myself to the motion now before this Committee, I do so with a double object: I feel myself challenged to uphold my opinion on the subject of responsible government as applied to this colony, and I am desirous to add a few words on the bearing of the subject in the matter of Confederation now before the Council. 1st. With respect to the subject of responsible government. As to this, sir, my views have been for a long time settled, and I shall endeavor to express them as clearly as I can; the result of them is expressed in a few words. I am in favor of the extension of representative institutions little by little, to the utmost verge of safety. But I am opposed in this community at least, to the establishment of what is called responsible government. These are my views shortly. I believe them to be the settled convictions of most moderate and experienced men not bound to flatter popular constituencies. And I believe I am doing a service to society in upholding such moderate views against the popular error and the popular bias in favor of the rash application of responsible government in such communities. I will start, sir, at once from an historical point of view. The hon member for New Westminster has, as I understand him, asserted that responsible government is the immemorial birthright of Englishmen, and that the principle of Cabinet ministers going in and out with votes of a majority of the House of Commons is a principle of ancient date. My understanding of the history of my country leads to a different conclusion and however much it may be clear and obvious that representative institutions are our natural and inalienable birthright—however much it may be established that the power of self taxation resides and has always resided in the representatives of the country, in the Commons of England, carrying with it the overwhelming power of the purse—it is, I believe clearly admitted that the principle of responsible government, as now understood, has existed for little more than 100 years, say from the accession of George III and the termination of Lord Bute's administration, so that I admit the hon gentleman's proposition only so far as this. Representative institutions are the birthright of the British nation; representative institutions and the privilege of taxing ourselves. Now, sir I believe the whole scope of representative institutions to be greatly misrepresented. It is the fashion for honourable members to say, that the Government of this or any other community are bound to govern according to the well understood wishes of the people; that the vox populi is the vox dei; that ministries and Governments are responsible to the people. But the true principle, as we all very well know, is that Governments and ministries are responsible, not to the people as a populace, but to the representatives of the people, properly and reasonably chosen. Governments and ministries are responsible not to numerical majorities, but to the country. Now, sir, representative institutions are liable to this obvious and well known danger. I will quote the words of a well known political writer, Herbert Spencer. "Whenever the profit accruing to the Representative individually, from the passage of a mischievous measure largely exceeds his loss as a unit in the community from the operation of the injurious law, his interest becomes antagonistic to that of his constituents, and sooner or later will sway his vote." How true and how obvious this is. I might go further when the private and personal, the direct and immediate interest of the representative or of the constituents, whose advocates and delegates they are, is opposed to any matter of legislative action. The direct and material interest will, of a certainty, prevail over the distant and more remote welfare of the community, in all but very rare instances. This is the danger that threatens all representative institutions, and the only safeguard against it is the qualification—the pecuniary and material qualification of the representative, the pecuniary and material qualifications of the elector, and accordingly we see representative institutions flourishing and successful only when this safeguard practically exists. Let us turn to the example of England. In England representative institutions and responsible Government work smoothly. And why? Because of the notoriously aristocratic and plutocratic character of the Legislature of Great Britain. Political life is a sealed book to any but the wealthy classes. Every member of Parliament is a man of property, no other can afford the luxury of of legislative life, and society is secure in the hands of representatives whose property would suffer from the results of vicious or reckless legislation. I say nothing of the question of peace and war, probably the most momentous and disastrous subject of vicious and reckless legislation, a question which will not arise in the colony. The cream of all legislation is taxation, and my solid conviction is that representative institutions and responsible Government will fail whenever the working majority is in the hands of an unsubstantial class of Representatives or of electors. I have thus, sir, treated of representative institutions and responsible Government somewhat in the abstract. I will now refer more particularly to its application to this colony, and this apart from any question of Confederation, and I will repeat that I am in favor of the extension to the utmost possible limits of the representative elements of this Council, but adverse to responsible Government. With respect to the constitution of the Legislative Council of British Columbia it might, I think, hardly be necessary in the present condition of the colony, to advocate a second chamber—a Council as distinct from an Assembly. However advisable this may be in an advanced condition of the colony, advanced in numbers and wealth, few, if any would advocate such an institution as a second Chamber. The elements for forming such a chamber are sadly wanting in the present state of affairs, and the matter may be dismissed without further comment—without discussing the advisability in a general way of such an institution at all, or the constitutional elements of such a body. But with regard to the Legislature on the supposition of its consisting of one single House, it will be necessary to speak at somewhat greater length. Of what elements ought such a legislative body to consist? At present it consists of official members, heads of departments. Official members not heads of departments but representing for the most part different Magisterial districts, a few nominated members—nominated, I think it is reasonable to presume, from an impression of their being tolerably intelligent and moderate—and a few representative members.

It is asked whether the constitution of this Council should be altered so as to set before direct responsible government, or what may be looked upon almost as its equivalent, a large working majority of responsible members. I leave out of the question at present, all reference to any modification of the constitution of the Council in the event of Confederation, and I consider the matter at present, only in reference to the Council and the Colony in their actual condition. At present it is obvious, and must be felt by all of us, by official members no less than by independent members, that our position as a Crown Colony, is what is commonly called a FALSE POSITION. We are individually as well fitted for self-government as our brothers or our cousins in the Old Country or in Canada. I will go further; I will say that the community taken individually in this Colony is BETTER qualified to demand and have representative institutions. I say taken INDIVIDUALLY - and I mean it in its strict sense. Man for man, I believe the Colonist a better politician than his English cousin. The aristocratic class hardly exists it is true. It is an injustice to presume for a moment that the Colonist in this, or any other colony of Anglo Saxon origin is in any way unfit for the enjoyment of the freest political liberty. Higher class we have none, but the middle and lower classes are, I do not hesitate to say it, superior to the middle and lower classes at home. The colonist is more enterprising, and more pushing than the stay at home Englishman. He has better knowledge of the world and of human nature, he graduates in a school in which politics are prominent, and he is free from an immense amount of ignorance and prejudice which is thought and written and acted in the old world. But then comes the consideration, what elements are indispensable in the community to form the representative body, if as is contended, that element is to be supreme, or what is the same thing in point of actual power, when that element constitutes the working majority? I will answer, 1. Localized and perma-

nent population. 2 Established diversified interests; wealth, whether capital or regular income, the well-doing of professions businesses and industries, agriculture, substantial industries, staples. Population herein we are deficient—6500 adult white men—sporadic, scattered and temporary. How many care to vote, how many are aliens Established interests here also are deficient; isolation our drawback; staples we have, but they are undeveloped or unlucky; gold mining is depressed; agriculture under a disadvantage and no good market; coal not much sought after and minerals a speculation; lumber unfortunate; fisheries unestablished and commerce in the way of export killed by the abolition of the free port, or inferior from the absence of a large home demand. These are all our material elements of wealth and we have them in no great abundance. Now without them what have we? A sparse community in which the only thriving interest is agriculture, and that only because supply is not equal to demand; or in other words small in numbers and importance and no wealthy class at all. Can self government be trusted to such a population? I say emphatically no! Now I am not greatly in favor of a high qualification for representatives for members of the Council, it is sufficient for me that they represent substantial interests: but when we have unsubstantial representatives representing unsubstantial and small constituencies I can hardly understand anything more dangerous, and I might add, more ridiculous or more extravagant. That representatives should be substantial people is desirable, but that they should represent substantial interests is indispensable. If representatives are unfaithful to their trust the remedy is possible; but where the class of electors is needy and unsubstantial, it seems impossible to conceive anything more disastrous. Taxation, as before has been observed, is the cream of legislation; and taxation at the hands of unsubstantial men, or men forced to advocate the interests of unsubstantial constituencies, will be nothing but tyranny. Opinions may be divided in many other matters, the votes of a party may be split on many points; but in the hands of the masses the substantial class will be heavily and unmeasurably taxed to suit the views of those who have nothing to lose and all to gain by any contemplated movement

Take the example of V.I., in old days, as an example of a small and a narrow community; again, the example of Victoria in Australia, where legislation is effected by the enormous majority of the advocates of the interests of constituents elected on a low qualification, manhood suffrage. I cannot but understand that if the Government is in the hands of the representatives of the people, and a working majority of the n—supreme representative Government, if not equivalent to, is, in effect, equal to responsible Government in the hands of the representatives of the people, supplies would all be voted except conditions were exacted favorable to the popular will. And, sir, having treated on representative and responsible Government as applied to this colony let us see its bearing on the subject of confederation, and here I follow in the footsteps of the honorable member for New Westminster, his reasoning is mine, but not his conclusion. Without responsible Government, or its equivalent, or its approximate Government by a representative majority, we have no safeguard against a Government of Canadian officials, British Columbia will be a colony of Canada, and penitence of a dependency, and Canadian interests will prevail. Dependence on England is bearable, they have no interests apart from ours, but dependence on Canada would be unbearable, their interests are different from ours. That is the conclusion that is inevitable, it is but a logical conclusion. Confederation without responsible Government, or Government by a working majority of representative members, is out of the question. Such a Government cannot be had; therefore Confederation is out of the question. I have thus, sir, given my opinion on a point which is sure to meet with popular disfavor, but I am proud to support the Executive when I think it is right; and I would share the responsibility of a measure which would make that Executive obnoxious to blame. I have no chronic feeling of opposition to Government. I have no objection to individuals, nor do I impute to them sordid motives, but in the matter of Confederation the Executive of this colony are in a false position, they act primarily not for the good of the colony, but for the good, or supposed good of Great Britain, and they exercise the power of Government in a matter in which the interests of the colony are mainly at stake to carry out, and effect an organic change of great importance to local interests. It is somewhat unfair for me to say I impute motive to the Executive. I only quarrel with them when they place themselves in a false position, as in the question of education, and in this as in education I say they oppose their own views to the views of the well understood wishes of all classes of the community; and here they carry through a scheme of Confederation; they start the stone, and it is hard to see how or where it will roll. I sincerely feel for their position The colony will demand representative institutions, and they will be forced to yield them or back out of the position they have undertaken. The answer of the Executive Government to this is as given by the Hon. Attorney General. The Attorney General says that after Confederation we are bound to have what we require—responsible Government. This is taking the matter for granted. It may be attained, but with a struggle It is impossible to doubt that the Executive of the new province will oppose representative Government or any diminution of their own rights and their own power. He says it is inopportune and beside the question. The honorable member for Cariboo (Dr. Carrall) says: "If the people of British Columbia want responsible Government no power on earth can prevent their having it." This is but a promise for the future. The Hon. Chief Commissioner says the community is not fit for responsible Government, but the matter is to be left to the new Council. Responsible Government will assuredly come with Confederation. The honorable member for Victoria (Dr. Helmcken) says: "This is the argument of the Government. But something must counterbalance Canada, otherwise with a working majority in the House the Dominion Government will keep things as they are when we are a province of Canada.

TUESDAY, 22 March.

Hon Holbrook—Mr Chairman, I rise with some diffidence to give my opinion as to whether we are fitted for Responsible Government or not, after the able speeches that have been delivered by hon members on the subject. The hon and learned member for Victoria City (Mr Drake) has affirmed that responsible government would give the real government of the Colony to Victoria. This I believe is true, and if such were the case what injury it would inflict on New Westminster and the Mainland generally. I feel that we are not yet fit for responsible government; but nevertheless, I think that the extent of the population is very much under estimated. It has been stated that after the most careful calculations that can be made the white population cannot be calculated at over 5000 adults, but I think this is wrong and no doubt it has been taken from the Government accounts which do not include Kootenay, Big Bend, or the settlements around New Westminster, and I would make the adult white population to be 10,000, besides 40,000 Indians, and these Indians ought not to be ignored If they are not represented will it not be difficult to make them contented with the change from the Imperial Government to Canada? And it is for this reason that I have given a notice of motion in this House to show them that they are not forgotten, and that they may go on with their settlements and improvements in safety. But if we are to have responsible government I will not be answerable for the consequences. We are told the question is to be submitted to the people, I say let us wait for their decision I have confidence in Canada and am content to take my chance of being well governed by the Dominion Government, rather than try something of the working of which we know nothing I have no doubt that great agitation on the subject of responsible government will be got up by the press and that many members will gain their elections by confusing the questions of Confederation and responsible government. I entirely concur with the hon Mr Wood in believing that more liberal representation will do much more for the good of the Colony than responsible government. I believe in a good franchise being given as foreshadowed by the Governor's speech, and I think twelve elected and eight nominated members would give satisfaction and work well, although report makes the change more liberal than this. We are now on the eve of prosperity. Our Quartz mining is still to be commenced and we only want good roads to Kootenay by way of Eagle Pass, to open our resources in this respect. I do not intend to enter upon the question of responsible government. I believe it would be bad for us and is not required by the people. I shall support the Government in the clause now under discussion

Hon Mr DeCosmos—Mr Chairman, I had not expected to say anything more on this subject; but on more mature reflection I am satisfied that it is my duty to do so. The more the matter is argued and the more the remarks of Government members are heard, the more I believe we are being asked to take a leap in the dark; for all I can learn is that the new House is to be partly nominative and partly elective—and not responsible; the proportions are not stated It has also cropped out that there will be a qualification for members and also for electors. If the Government refer this matter to the people to know whether such a Constitution will suit them, I believe the people to almost a unit will reject it. The mass are opposed to Confederation altogether unless they can get a more liberal representation than that proposed by the Government. At the outset I proposed a committee of all parties to consider and report upon the whole matter; but the hasty judgment of the House, as I think, deferred the question. Now, sir, I think if the committee had met and suggested for the protection of the property element that one-third of the members of the Council should be elected for a longer period and hold property qualifications, the country would have been satisfied. I can conceive, on some such proposition as that being laid before the House, it would have been eminently successful; as it now stands it is matter of opinion. I think the Governor has been led into error if the utterances that occasionally drop from members of this House mean anything. I cannot conceive that the people will accept such a Constitution. I should prefer that we should go into Confederation as a unit I have made these few remarks to set my mind at rest and to save myself trouble with my constituents if I should offer myself as a candidate again I state that I believe the Government will jeopardise Confederation on this point.

Hon Mr Dewdney—Sir, The question now under consideration has been so fully gone into by hon members of this Council, that I feel it will be useless for me to take up the time of this House to any great length. At the commencement of this debate I had several arguments which I proposed to bring before you not only against responsible government, but I find that these have been ably handled by other honorable gentlemen far more ably than I could have hoped to do, and should I not have been convinced at the earlier stages of this debate, other arguments have been adduced which now completely set my mind at rest on the subject. I am opposed to the recommendations of both the hon members for New Westminster and Lillooet, particularly the latter, and in opposing them I do not feel I am injuring the cause of Confederation But while I feel, Mr Chairman, that it is unnecessary for me to enter into the question of responsible government, I think I should not be doing my duty where I to remain silent upon one matter connected with this debate—one upon which I consider I am as capable of giving an opinion as any hon member of this council, namely, the feeling of the inhabitants of the mainland generally with regard to responsible government. I have travelled through this country as much as any hon member of this council, and I have been brought in contact with all classes and have mixed with all classes, and I have yet to meet the first individual who has expressed to me his desire for responsible government. Now, Mr Chairman, do you believe, does this council believe that the cry throughout this colony is, down with the present form of government—let us have responsible government. Hon members of this House are aware, I presume, that my avocations for some years past, in fact as long as I have been in the Colony, have necessarily brought me in contact with all classes, and should this have been the cry do you think I should not have heard it? I say distinctly again I have yet to meet the first individual who has expressed to me his desire for responsible government. The feeling of my constituents is not in favor of responsible government; on the contrary it was distinctly expressed to me that they do not desire any change in the present form of government. All they want is money to keep their trails in order and a resident magistrate to administer and carry out the laws I believe that some hon members of this House have mistaken the feelings of the country on this matter. Any dissatisfaction that exists is not with the present system of government but with the expense of carrying the system out. We all feel that, and we all know that it cannot be avoided for reasons which have been given over and over again in this house, namely, the smallness of population, scattered as it is over so vast an area. I have not heard during the debate any arguments that will prove to me or to this house that under responsible government we could have a cheaper form of government. I for one could not be convinced that we should. I believe that the public monies would be wasted, peculation and dishonesty would be the order of the day. We are told by the hon member for Yale we must have a beginning. I am aware of that fact, and for one shall assist to put off the evil day. I prefer for a time, until our population increases, to live under the present form of government, one under which, I am proud to say, I have lived for eleven years without seeing the faults of maladministration and other evil accusations that have been hurled at it by the hon member for Lillooet. I am aware that that hon gentleman was himself in some subordinate position under the government; he may of his own personal knowledge, while in

that capacity, be aware of some malpractice, but I defy him to point out a single instance brought before the notice of the government that did not receive the strictest investigation and in which the individual complained of, if the charges were proved, was not discharged. In conclusion, Mr Chairman, I shall take this opportunity of expressing my appreciation of the officers generally that have carried on the government of this Colony during the eleven years that I have lived here, and I challenge any hon gentleman to prove by the records of Her Majesty's colonies that, in any colony or dependency of the British Crown laws have been more justly administered, life and property better protected, or the affairs of the colony carried on with greater rectitude than in the one in which we are now living. Holding these views, I must decline to support either of the recommendations before the committee.

Hon Mr Alston—Sir, I am in favor of responsible government, but not the form that has been discussed in this House at so great a length. I believe all representative governments are responsible. The hon and learned member for Victoria city has quoted John Stuart Mill. I believe, Sir, that the word responsible government does not occur in his book; he shows that the form applicable to one country will not do for another. We have heard enough in this Council to make me believe that the people do not want responsible government; I believe that a representative form of government is the only form that will suit this Colony. It has been well shown by the hon Mr Wood, that from the difficulty of getting districts represented, this Colony is not adapted for purely representative institutions. I think it most desirable that Executive members should have seats in this Council, and I think that a partially elective House would best represent the interests of the entire community. The American form of government is in a certain sense responsible, Executive officers being elected for a term of four years. England possesses a different form, and Canada differs again from England. The colony from which Governor Musgrave came is the last that has received responsible government; thus we may fairly trust to His Excellency to judge for us as to the probability of its working well here. The smallest colony possessing responsible government is Prince Edward's Island, and we who do not possess a population one-twelfth the size of that of Newfoundland, are asking for responsible government. The hon and learned member for Victoria city (Mr Drake), who seems to uphold responsible government against his own convictions, admits that all power would be held in Victoria, and he says that there would be no harm in such centralization. I think, Sir, that he has read John Stuart Mill to little purpose if such be his convictions.

Hon Mr Humphreys—Sir, I am more impressed than ever with the absolute need of responsible government. I think the hon Chief Commissioner particularly, and the hon member for Victoria city, have proved conclusively that two-thirds of the people representing property are determined to have responsible government. The hon member for the city told us the people were not in favor of responsible government, and in the same sentence he tells us that if Confederation were set before the people with responsible government mixed up with it the people would take responsible government to the exclusion of material interests. I have said and say again I am in favor of Confederation, and I earnestly hope that it will be for the benefit of the colony. I sometimes think that some hon members at the other end of the House intend to defeat Confederation. I may be called an extremist—an agitator; I admit I am. I desire to see the people having a share in the government, instead of being under a despotism, or what is equivalent to it. I have been in this Colony nearly eleven years; I am satisfied that the people want responsible government. Hon members say there are different forms of responsible government; admitted. I am not sure that it would be advisable to introduce any one system in its entirety here. Hon members have been quoting writers upon this subject; I will quote Lord Macaulay, he says, "Government, like a good coat, is fit for the body for which it is made." I say if we cannot live on responsible government, we cannot live on irresponsible government. I do not know what is shadowed forth in His Excellency's speech; I confess I cannot understand it. If the Governor had promised a two-thirds elective House, with heads of departments sitting to give information without voting, then I think the question of responsible government would never have been considered. I ask hon members to endeavor to approximate; and if they cannot agree to full responsible government, then to give us as liberal a form as they can. If you withhold responsible government you lose Confederation.

Hon Mr Robson—Mr Chairman, in rising to reply to what has fallen from hon gentlemen in opposition to responsible government, I crave the kind indulgence of this House; and should I, in the course of my remarks, appear unduly harsh or unkind, I beg hon gentlemen to attribute it to earnestness in advocating a great cause, rather than to a desire to wound the feelings of any. The hon member for Cariboo, who is also a member of the Executive, made a very convenient, yet, to my mind, singularly ineffective reply to one point in my speech of Friday. I had, or fancied I had, with considerable force and elaborateness, pointed out the difficulties that might naturally be presumed to lie in the way of obtaining responsible government under the new constitution proposed to be conferred upon this colony; and the only answer is that the Organic Act makes the necessary provision. I was as well aware of the provision made in that Act before the hon gentleman spoke as after; but no attempt has been made to meet the difficulties I suggested. The hon gentleman, with that facetiousness, poetry and ready wit for which he is so justly celebrated, proceeded to point out the undesirableness of responsible government in this colony. Under it, he told us, Cabinets would be too versatile. In fact, he described the working of such institutions as a sort of dissolving views, a thimble-rigging operation, now you see it, now you don't, in such quick succession would the changes be rung. The Chief Commissioner would, it appeared from his description, be much like Lincoln's celebrated flea. Now, sir, where did the hon gentleman acquire his experience of the working of responsible government? Was it not in Canada? What do we find to be the experience of that country? Certainly it does not in any way warrant the conclusions arrived at by my hon friend. On the contrary, we find a change of Ministry to be of very rare occurrence. The present Premier of Canada has, with one unimportant intermission, been at the head of the government for some 12 or 14 years! As I stated on a former occasion, the people of British Columbia are not politicians; nor are they fond of change. They are naturally conservative. Give them a people's government, and in no part of Her Majesty's Colonial Empire will a less versatile, a more conservative and loyal people be found. The hon gentleman said responsible government would blow the chaff into this House. Now, although I listened with pleasure, as I always do, to that gentleman's oratory and humor, I could not but experience a feeling of regret to find him on the wrong side of a great question; making a false step. It is sad to witness the early mistakes of a young man of such talents, ambition and promise; and when I hear such words coming from my hon friend, I begin to fear that the bright future, the brilliant political career I had marked out for him may never be realized. Sir, a certain proportion of chaff may be blown into this House, under responsible government, as is the case now; but, depend upon it, under the form of government we seek, the chaff would quickly be blown out at the back door before the breath of public opinion. The people can always discriminate between wheat and chaff, and responsible government supplies the most effective winnowing-fan with which to separate the two. We were reminded by that hon gentleman that responsible government had its failures as well as its successes; and he referred to Victoria, Australia, and to Jamaica, as instances of failure. Now, I cannot but think the hon gentleman has been singularly unfortunate in going to these colonies to prove his proposition. The former ranks amongst the most flourishing, progressive and wealthy of all Her Majesty's Colonial Possessions. Doubtless very grave political difficulties were encountered, and many mistakes characterised the earlier working of responsible government in that fine colony; but it would be most unfair to charge all these to the possession of such institutions. Nay, most of them had their origin in a different political system. As for Jamaica, hon gentlemen must be aware that it never possessed responsible government. A mixed representative system it had; and the chief cause of failure was the absence of responsibility. It was just because those who administered the affairs of that unfortunate colony were not responsible to the people that the opposition, led by the ill-fated Gordon—a man of unquestionable ability although, perhaps, somewhat deficient in judgment—was induced finally to assume the extreme attitude which resulted so fatally. The hon and learned Attorney General made an effort, not altogether warranted by facts, to force the advocates of responsible government into a false and disadvantageous position, in relation to the Government programme; but hon gentlemen will recollect how anxious I was, at the beginning of this debate, to meet the views and adopt the suggestions of that hon and learned gentleman, in respect to the particular time and mode of approaching this question. My desire to give the Government a general and strong support upon the great question of Confederation is no secret in this House; and I think I can speak with equal confidence in regard to the views and intentions of my hon friend on my left. [The member for Yale.] But enough has already been said upon this point; and I have only to add that I utterly refuse to occupy the position in which the hon and learned Attorney General appears desirous of placing me. That hon gentleman was content to give the same answer to the main objection as that given all round the Government end of the table, viz, that the Organic Act provides the necessary and ready means of obtaining what we seek; and he further tells us that, inasmuch as responsible government relieves Governors of responsibility, a Governor would naturally be ready to make the concession. Such, however, is not the accustomed working of human nature. Such is not the lesson of history. The ruler hugs power as the miser does his gold, nor parts with it only as it is extorted piecemeal by the people. I am charged with having used threats—threats of blood! Now, sir, I must plead 'not guilty' to this charge. While carefully avoiding everything in the nature of threat and prediction, I asked the Government to read carefully those lessons written in blood around us, and implored them to take warning from the errors and profit by the successes of others. We were told by the hon and learned Attorney General that the Governor is powerless to grant what the resolution asks; but might not the same objection be raised to almost every recommendation passed in connection with Confederation? His Excellency is asking Her Majesty's Government for power to give us a new constitution. The resolution merely suggests a more liberal constitution than His Excellency proposes, there is, therefore, no weight in this objection. The hon gentleman next tells us that the resolution implies want of confidence in the Canadian Government—that they will not listen to the cry of the people for responsible government. Now the hon gentleman must be aware that Canada can only listen to our cry when it is heard in the particular form prescribed by the constitution. The people can only cry through the Government it is proposed to give them under the constitution foreshadowed in His Excellency's opening message; and I have already endeavored to point out the probability that the new Government might refuse to utter a cry in that direction at the desire of the people. There is no such expression of want of confidence in the resolution. The Canadian Government could not interfere—would have no power to give us responsible government until asked by our local Government to do so. Such objections I must, therefore, regard as frivolous, and utterly unworthy of the hon and learned Attorney General. The honorable Chief Commissioner followed with his accustomed ability, but I venture to think, without his usual discretion. That honorable gentleman set out by telling us that he quite understood it to be necessary for certain members, in order to be consistent with pen and speech outside of this House, to bring forward this subject; that it was a logical necessity, inexorable fate. Now, sir, I cannot see into that honorable gentleman's heart, any more than I can into the mysterious Executive Chamber. I will not, therefore, permit myself to impute motives to that honorable gentleman in his opposition to responsible government; but he must permit me to be the best judge of those motives which have impelled me, with some degree of reluctance, to take a stand in opposition to the government upon this question. It may appear necessary, in order to be consistent with word and pen, that I should advocate in this House great principles which I have advocated elsewhere; but it may be permitted me to say that, whether here or elsewhere, I advocate responsible government under Confederation, because I conceive it not only to be the right of the people, but their interest also. We are constantly told that we should not have mixed this question up with the terms. We have not mixed it up with the terms; but the government has mixed the terms up with it; and if there is any blame, any responsibility in this connection it must rest with the government, and not with the Opposition. The honorable gentleman tells us that it is impossible to work responsible government with a population so scattered; and in the same breath he tells us that we have responsible government now,—that the officials are responsible to the Governor, and he to the Queen. Well, certainly this is a sort of responsibility; but it is not precisely the kind we want. The responsibility now existing takes the wrong direction. It is not responsibility to the people, but to the supreme power. In this sense the most despotic form of government in the world may be termed responsible government. The members of the government of the Czar of Russia are responsible to him, and he is responsible to The Great Ruler of all; Ergo, Russia has responsible government! The honorable gentleman must see the absurdity of his very startling proposition.

He next tells us that if the people desire responsible government it is because they have been educated up to it by the Press. There is more in this than argument in this. Doubtless the Press is, in this, as in other civilized countries, the great educator of the people, especially in matters political. Have not the people of England been similarly educated up to every great political reform? Such constitutes a legitimate and important function of the Press. But the honorable gentleman goes further and tells us that if the present government is unpopular with the people the responsibility rests with the Press which has, by misrepresentation, created prejudice in the public mind. This proposition I beg most unqualifiedly to deny. The honorable gentleman has confounded cause and effect. The Press has opposed the government because it is unpopular; and the government is unpopular because it is not a people's government—because it does not possess the principles of reform to the people. It must be remembered that the Press subsists on popular favor; and in order to subsist it must oppose an unpopular form of government. The Press of this colony has acted rather as the exponent than the moulder and leader of public opinion in its opposition to the present form of government. As I have repeatedly said, it is not the officials that are unpopular, so much as the system under which they administer. No officials can be popular under such a system. It places them in a false position. The Press is, therefore, not to blame; it is the faithful exponent of public opinion. The honorable gentleman on my left, (Mr Holbrook,) dissents from this view. It is the habit of some honorable gentlemen to affect to sneer at the Press of this colony. They admit that the Press of England is all I claim for it; but they allude sneeringly to the Press of this colony. Now, I am free to admit that the leading journal of this colony would lose by a comparison with the leading journal of England. It is smaller, and, perhaps, less ability is displayed in its editorial columns. But would not such a comparison be unfair? Apply this rule to the other institutions of the colony, and what would be the result? Taking the Press of this colony with all its imperfections, and I boldly assert that it will compare favorably with that of any other country of like age and population. That is the way to institute the comparison; and it is the only true way. When I hear honorable gentlemen indulging in sneers at the Press I invariably arrive at one conclusion; and I will not tell you what that conclusion is. It will not be necessary for me to again allude to the improper use made of what I said about the lawyer-handed class, especially as the hon Mr Walkem fully vindicated me. One more point I have done with the hon the Chief Commissioner. That gentleman repeated the now stereotyped argument that the Dominion Government, being based on liberal institutions, would not withhold responsible government, if desired by the people of British Columbia. That argument has been so often met that I was surprised to hear it repeated by that honorable gentleman. Need I say, for the twentieth time, that it is not the prerogative of the Canadian Government to give, unless asked by our local government, and that our local government will, from its organic nature, be averse to asking anything of the kind? Surely I am entitled to regard the constant iteration of these exploded arguments as evidence of the weakness of the government cause. Passing to the speech of the honorable Mr Walkem, my task is an easy one; for although that honorable gentleman spoke with his accustomed eloquence and agreeableness of word and manner, all must have felt that his effort had about it an air of special pleading in a bad cause. The principal objection that gentleman brought against the position I took on Friday was that responsible government is not a principle, but a form. Now I think it may be regarded as either or both, and I am not disposed to quarrel about mere words. What I contend for is responsible government. That honorable gentleman tells us that Canada did not get responsible government till her population reached about two millions. Now, while it at gentleman is greatly astray in his figures, I cannot discover in his facts any evidence in support of the proposition he wishes to establish. They may prove that responsible government was long wrongfully withheld from British Columbia. I now come to my honorable friend the senior member for Victoria city. That honorable gentleman started out by telling us that he intended to support the government scheme, and to support it strongly; but he added that he would not say much about responsible government. Would that he had adhered to the latter resolution. It was a natural, that, feeling himself on the wrong side of a great principle, he should be disposed to say little. But, unfortunately for himself he said much, a great deal too much. He said some things which I would have been much better to have left unsaid. He told us that government for, by and from the people means government for, by and with the politicians. But he does not stop there. He tells this House that the advocates of responsible government will be willing to surrender all the other conditions, in order to obtain that form of government as a means of securing office, power, pickings! Now, sir, let us look at the political history and position of the honorable gentleman who presumes with so much boldness to judge of other people's motives. I recollect when, some two years ago, that honorable gentleman was one of the ardent of all Confederationists, when he desired to rush into an unconditional and blind union, when he urged the then Governor to negotiate union by telegraph. At that time I was doubtful about the policy of immediate union, regarding such a step as somewhat premature and unreal, so long as the immense intervening territory remained an unorganized and unopen waste. Holding these views, I proposed to strike the word 'immediate' out of the resolution which had been moved by the honorable Mr Dockmos; but so enthusiastic, so fanatical was the honorable the senior member for Victoria City that he longed for a stronger word than 'immediate.' Subsequently we saw that honorable gentleman the most ardent, the most rabid Anti-Confederate. We saw him opposing it in every way, both in the House and out of it, denouncing Canada as a most undesirable connection. Now, what do we see? We see the Anti-Confederate Lion rampant suddenly metamorphosed into the Canadian Lamb passant, with his longing eyes fixed on Ottawa! Such has been the magic influence of the my-terious Executive Chamber. I do not, for one, regret the transformation; but I do object to that gentleman turning round so suddenly and denouncing the motives by which others are actuated. Does not that honorable gentleman live in a 'glass house' in that sense which peculiarly disentitles him to throw stones? Is not he guilty of measuring other people's corn in his own bushel? Did not he cast all the political principles (!) to the winds and bolt in at the very first opening to place and power that presented itself? And who knows but there may be at this moment a mission to Ottawa dangling temptingly before his eager eyes? Is this the man who is entitled to turn round and, looking down from his pinnacle of temporary power, judge others? Strutting his hour of brief authority, he taunts us with seeking responsible government as a stepping stone to power and pickings. I hurl back, with scorn and contempt, the accusation in his teeth! To pass, however, to the so-called arguments put forward by that honorable gentleman, he tells us that the resolution asks for a government like that of Ontario,—that we should require 40 or 50 members. Now, sir, it is difficult to give him credit for sincerity, as every honorable member must see that the resolution asks nothing of the kind. It asks for a constitution based upon the principle of responsible government as existing in Ontario. That honorable gentleman has attempted to make me inconsistent with myself in saying that we shall be under the heel of Canada without responsible government, and that Canada desires we should have such institutions. Now, I see nothing inconsistent in this. Canada does desire that the people of British Columbia should possess as full powers of managing their own local affairs as the people of the other Provinces possess; but Canada will have no power to grant these institutions until asked to do so in a constitutional way through and by our local government; and the weight of my objection lies in the reasonable belief that, however desirous the people may be, the local government will be naturally averse to a change calculated to lessen its power, and weaken the tenure by which its members hold office. Again, we are told that the Governor would not be disposed to withhold institutions which would relieve him of responsibility. However plausible this proposition may appear in theory, it is scarcely borne out by experience. As I have already stated in reply to the honorable and learned Attorney General, history presents rulers in a different light. We are asked what measures of importance have been introduced that have not been introduced by the government? By this the honorable gentleman wishes, I presume, to imply the idea that the government so fully meets the wants of the people as to leave nothing for representative members to do. In what singular contrast is this with his utterances during past sessions. Here again we have the kindly blessing of the double Confederation Lamb instead of the terrific roar of the anti-confederate lion of the past. Verily, the mysterious influence of the Executive Chamber must be potent. The honorable gentleman tells us that if we couple the question of respect the Government with the conditions of union, the people will be willing to accept poorer terms in their eagerness to obtain it. Surely, if language means anything, this is an inadvertent admission of what the honorable gentleman has been so at to by denying, viz: that the people desire responsible Government. Leaving the honorable gentleman to the lashings of his own conscience and to the seductive influences of the mysterious Executive Chamber, we next come to deal with the hon. the Inspector of Schools. The Hon. Mr. Alston announces himself in favor of responsible Government, but not that kind that would make the heads of Departments go in and out. He holds all representative Government to be responsible Government. The hon. gentleman may be entitled to hold a theory peculiarly his own; but it is scarcely the fitting time to announce personal theories. We are now dealing with the question of responsible Government, as understood by political economists, not as understood by the honorable gentleman who has just propounded a political paradox. He has been reading J. S. Mill and he tells us that writer never mentions responsible Government. I have not read Mill's theory, but I have read enough to know that he goes even farther than I am prepared to go in the direction of responsibility. We have next the honorable gentleman for Kootenay, telling this House that with all his experience in the colony he never heard a man express a desire for responsible Government, and that his own constituents were distinctly opposed to it. Now, so far as that honorable gentleman's constituents are concerned, I am prepared to think that his opportunities of learning their views upon that or any other subject have scarcely been such as to entitle him to express a very positive opinion on the subject; but when he tells the House that in all his experience in this colony he has never heard a desire for responsible Government expressed, I can only say that I am surprised. The honorable gentleman cannot but know, if he has not turned a deaf ear to political altogether, that the question of responsible Government has been a prominent issue at more than one election, and that it has been used as one of the chief reasons for Confederation from one end of the colony to the other. But, sir, I fear I have already wearied the House. Permit me to say, however, that throughout it is protracted debate the efforts from the Government side of the House have been characterized by a want of argument and by a sort of special pleading, a begging of the question almost painful to listen to. Every effort has been made to raise false issues and to misconstrue remarks coming from this side of the House, and a most unfair attempt has been made to place the whole question in a false and disadvantageous position; yet, this is scarcely surprising. It was too much to be expected that the representative members would approve the measure. I feel, however, quite indifferent about their votes. We have a large majority of the representative members with us, and their vote must virtually carry the measure. The great proposition I desire to impress upon honorable members is this: The colony is about to become a province of the Dominion of Canada. No union can be equitable and just which does not give this colony equal political power—equal control over their own local affairs with that possessed by the people of the provinces with which it is proposed to unite. I care not how good the other conditions may be, if the people of British Columbia are placed in a false political position they will not be content, and the inauguration of such a union will only prove the beginning of new, bitterness discontent and agitation. Mistakes will doubtless result from the first workings of responsible Government, but these mistakes were better made now than years hence, when the consequences might be more serious. The period of inspiring, stammering infancy must be passed. Surely, it is better to pass it now, while the political questions are few and simple and the interests comparatively small, than to wait for great development. Almost every speaker on the Government side has evinced a want of confidence in the Dominion Government. I have no want of confidence in that Government. I know the men who compose it too well for that. I know them as honorable, liberal, large minded statesmen. But it is our local Government under the new Constitution proposed in terms so vague in his Excellency's opening message that I doubt. The Canadian Government will possess no Constitutional power to grant us political relief until asked to do so by our local Government; and it is the hesitation, the disinclination of the local government to move in that direction which I dread. I would again warn the Government against endangering the whole scheme by having it submitted to the people under cover of an "Responsible Government."

Hon Dr Carrall—Sir: On Friday last the honorable member for New Westminster spoke at some length upon this subject, and I replied as best I could, and it is in accordance with the eternal fitness of things that I would make a very few remarks. It is one of those happy things in nature that where the poison is there is the antidote always near. (Laughter.) I propose to give the antidote. I laid down two principles: First, that the Government did not believe that responsible government as its maintained in England

was applicable to this colony. I hold to that. I maintain that no one has controverted this proposition; no one has proved that it could be adapted to the requirements of this colony, there has been burning eloquence and all that sort of thing, but no proof. But I say, sir, that even now there is a measure of responsibility in this Government I am responsible to my constituents, and if there is such an overwhelming force in favor of responsible government can I ever return here. The utmost that the hon rable member for New Westminster has proved is, that under confederation it would take a great deal of time and much agitation to get responsible government, a minimum of five years a maximum of ten years, and that as it would take that time it was better that we should have it at once. I say if one proposition is correct the other must be incorrect. If there is such an overwhelming desire on the part of the people for it, they will get it. If the majority even are in favor of responsible Government there is no constitutional power to prevent their getting it. There is no desire on the part of the Government to withhold it. I say it is the want of responsibility of the Executive that has rendered them unpopular, but the people have never been asked to contrast the present form of government with that shadowed out by his Excellency, and I say that heads of Departments under that system will be to a certain extent responsible The present system is bad, but the officers are good. I say that the requirements of the colony will be met by the system proposed by his Excellency. If it is not, then let the people say so, and get responsible government. The honorable member for New Westminster allows that it is only a question of time under the Organic Act If it should take five years, then my point that there is not such a strong desire for it is proved. I said, and I say again, that in Jamaica they could not work responsible government or even representative institutions, and in Victoria it remains to this day a monument of stupidity and mismanagement. With regard to the assertion of the honorable member for New Westminster I say that if speaking and voting from conviction are false steps and a bar to advancement in political life, then I don't want to advance a step further in that direction. I say that responsible government has not been made a distinct issue in elections The government of the people was to be one of the consequences of confederation; I hope we shall get a people's government before it. The present Executive Council is one-third unofficial, the work they have done has brought a shapeless, formless phantom into one harmonious whole, and they propose to precede confederation with a form of government which will enable the people to decide what form of government they will have I coincide with the Hon Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, that it was not necessary to introduce this subject into the Confederation Resolution. I am sorry that it was brought up at all in connection with our scheme.

HON DR HELMCKEN—Sir I wish to say in reply to the remarks of the honorable member for New Westminster, that I support the government from conviction. I do not shirk my responsibility, I said that the one great thing that the supporters of responsible government are afraid of is that it shall be set alongside of representative government. Honorable members may find when the resolutions return from Canada that I have still something to say upon them.

The recommendation of Hon. Mr. Humphreys was put by the Chair and on division was lost

The recommendation of Hon. Mr Robson was put by the Chair and on division was lost.

Clause fifteen then passed as read.

THE HON ATTORNEY GENERAL introduced clause sixteen

16. The provisions in "The British North American Act, 1867," shall (except those parts thereof which are in terms made or by reasonable intendment may be held to be specially applicable to and only affect one and not the whole of the provinces now comprising the Dominion, and except so far as the same may be varied by this resolution) be applicable to British Columbia in the same way and to the like extent as they apply to the other provinces of the Dominion, and as if the Colony of British Columbia had been one of the provinces originally united by the said act

HON DR HELMCKEN and HON MR DRAKE objected to this clause on the ground that its passing would kill the notices already on the paper.

THE HON ATTORNEY GENERAL gave an assurance that the resolutions of which notice had been given should be discharged, and the opposition was withdrawn.

Clause sixteen passed as read.

With reference to defences:—

A That it shall be an understanding with the Dominion, that their influence will be used to the fullest extent to procure the continued maintenance of the Naval Station at Esquimalt.

B Encouragement to be given to develop the efficiency and organization of the Volunteer force in British Columbia.

On clause A being read by the Chairman, HON MR HOLBROOK objected to Esquimalt being named on the ground that it was only fair to New Westminster that one gunboat should be stationed there.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—I should have been very sorry to have this clause inserted if I thought it would give us only two or three gunboats.

HON COLONIAL SECRETARY (Mr Hankin)—Because the Naval Station is at Esquimalt, it does not follow that every ship will remain there. The commanding officer can send ships where he pleases

Clause A passed as read.

HON MR HUMPHREYS asked what 'encouragement' meant in clause B

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—At present there is no means of ascertaining what encouragement can be given, I suppose arms and money.

Clause B passed as read.

HON MR DECOSMOS—Mr Chairman, I gave notice of my intention to bring up a clause with regard to provision being made to protect the agricultural produce of this colony. It has been said by the hon Executive member for Victoria City that this differential tariff is quite a new thing to me If he will take the trouble to refer to the COLONIST of the 15th May, 1868, he will find that in article written by myself, I touched on this matter; it is not new to me. I am thoroughly persuaded that the District which I represent will be a unit against Confederation without a provision to keep up protection. From Comox to Sooke the opinion on this point is as that of one man, and I believe I may say that it is the same thing as regards the whole of the agricultural districts on the Mainland, from Soda Creek to Kamloops. I hold with respect to protection that when farmers shall be able to produce farm produce in sufficient quantity to enable them to reduce their prices as low as the prices obtained by the farmers of Oregon and Washington Territory, then protection is not essential, for this great and sufficient reason that if we can produce as good an article at home as we can get abroad, which we can put down at the same price, the cost of transport will be a sufficient protection. Our farmers will have a natural protection. With regard to manufactures, I am one of those who believe that our manufactures ought to be protected. If we go into public works we must have wagons and machinery, and the wagon builders should have protection; then again, farming implements should be made in the colony, and encouragement should be given to the manufacturer of these things. Again there are the bootmaker and tailor, and the soap maker and others, even the brewer, for whom we require protection. I ask from the Executive the insertion of this principle: 'That British Columbia shall be entitled to levy and collect any tax or taxes on the sales of foreign produce and manufactures entered for home consumption, equal in amount to the duties of Customs now levied and collected on the same under the 'Customs Ordinance, 1867,' provided, always, that British Columbia shall not be entitled to levy and collect any such tax or taxes as aforesaid, if the duties of Customs of Canada extended and applied to British Columbia at the time of and after union, on such foreign produce and manufactures shall be as high as the duties of Customs now levied and collected on the same under the Customs Ordinance, 1867,' and provided, always, that such foreign produce and manufactures shall be construed to mean no more and none other than such foreign produce and manufactures as may enter into competition with the produce and manufactures of British Columbia.' I don't care how it is put in, our manufacturers would come into competition with goods from Canada That is a natural evil which we cannot avoid. There will be other advantages arising out of Confederation which will counterbalance this.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I have nothing to do with the hon gentleman's newspaper articles. I can only say that differential duties are contrary to the views of Her Majesty's Government.

HON MR DRAKE—The hon member's explanation is different from the clause itself. I suppose from the explanation that it is intended to apply to all foreign produce and manufactures imported I think it will be better that I should move my motion as an amendment to his, so as to confine the protection to agricultural produce.

HON MR DECOSMOS—I don't expect any resolution of mine to pass. If it should pass I shall be quite surprised; but as I hold this to be the very key-stone, and of more consequence than responsible government, I deem it my duty to bring it forward But to confine the protection to agricultural produce will not reach the issue It would not touch our rude manufactures.

HON DR HELMCKEN—This is left an open question by the Government. I wish it to be distinctly understood that this question of the agriculture of the country is an open question. I think I shall be found on the side of these hon gentlemen I think with the hon member for Victoria District that this is the most important question comprised in these resolutions. If the terms do not contain a clause giving protection to agricultural interests, I will answer for it there will be no Confederation.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I would ask the hon member to define how far this is left an open question?

HON DR HELMCKEN—I mean that every member of the Government is free to vote as he pleases upon this question of encouragement to the agricultural interests of the Colony.

HON MR WOOD—Then it is free for official members to vote these recommendations?

HON DR HELMCKEN—Certainly it is, and it is right that it should be so; for I consider, sir, that we have come to a most important question, one that concerns our our own country. Confederation must not come like an eclipse, it must not produce a darkness and then leave us to recover. I say that if these terms are left to pass as they are and return from Canada, and are passed by the people, they will produce great ills I say that the agricultural interests are most important; when we come to manufacturing interests it is different, they have made but little progress Manufacturers will meet with competition from Canada and the Dominion would not stand it, we cannot have protection for manufactures, but with regard to farm produce it is different. I say that the farmers could not exist without protection; you will depopulate the country by bringing Confederation without protection. I have stated that this Colony offers more inducement to people to settle than any other colony I know of, yet we do not raise sufficient stock for ourselves. Look at the statistics, $111,447 is the value of agricultural produce—barley, flour, malt, wheat and oats—imported. Of barley there is nearly one million pounds imported, and this would take about 450 acres to grow in; of malt about 4500 bushels, which would require ninety acres to grown in; of flour and wheat about 87,000 bushels which would require about 2500 acres; to grow in; of oats about 2,364 bushels, which would require about sixty acres to grow in; altogether about 3,080 acres. More land must be in cultivation to produce the quantity of cereals which I have enumerated as being imported annually, and this number of acres, supposing a man to cultivate fifty acres, would give employment to 123 men; so that 123 men will save the colony $111,477, or $900 each, besides growing what they want for their own consumption. In relation to this it must be recollected that mills would be at work to grind, machinery would be required, and labor of other kinds would be required, such, for instance, as brewers In addition to this comes in pigs there were 508 of these animals imported last year, less by 28 than in the preceding year. This is an improvement, when we consider that the amount of bacon and ham imported is 61,740 pounds less than last year. To make this bacon about 500 hogs are required; so you will see that nearly the whole amount of bacon is made by and from foreign hogs. Take butter—82,000 pounds or forty tons were imported last year It will take 400 more cows yielding 200 pounds each per annum to produce this amount, and it would save the colony $31,538 per annum. One thousand seven hundred head of beef cattle would save annually $96,949, but it presupposes 6,800 more cows at least. Now then to supply ourselves with beef and mutton, and cheese, 3,000 more cows are required; but it takes four years to produce beef. We import 7,000 sheep. Surely, no one will tell us that we have no room for 7,000 sheep or 3,000 cows. Why, it only means 20,000 acres, or thirty-six miles of land; six miles will supply the cereals, thirty-six miles in all. Why, the flats at the Fraser would yield it all. The cattle business certainly requires capital, but the capital will produce great results, and recollect the good it would do the country, the amount of labor employed and land cultivated for the purpose; wool hides and bones for house use or export. What I wish to impress upon you, sir, is the profit that might be derived from the introduction of a couple hundred families. What an immense loss the colony would sustain if this were thrown open to the Americans. What a magnificent field for immigration, particularly when we consider how much more of agriculture produce will be required when public works are carried on The market is good now, how much better it would be then. I think it would be doing

those farmers who had commenced farming under a protective tariff, a great injustice to withdraw protection from them now. We must have an agricultural population. If Confederation comes and brings the Canadian tariff we destroy the agricultural interests altogether and the country will become a wilderness. Confederation without these terms will not, in my opinion, be accepted. Leave them out and Confederation will most assuredly fail. Farmers in the upper country have a natural protection from the difficulty of transport. The day will come, and pretty quickly, when they will raise more there than than they have a market for. They must find an outlet, which must be where the consumers are. If the duty is not maintained how can they send their produce down. If the railway should be built, the cost of transporting goods from the interior will be diminished, and farmers of the Upper country will then find the tariff of more consequence to them than to the people of the lower country. I say Confederation will not go down without protection. The agricultural interest will prefer living in comfort with protection and without Confederation than in a perpetual struggle for livelihood under Confederation. I am in favor of protecting our farming interests, but if we had a lower scale upon some other goods, I should think it an advantage. I support protection to the agricultural interest, and the throwing open of our ports to other things. The latter part is I fear, not an open question.

Hon Collector of Customs (Mr Hamley)—It is difficult to tell which resolution the hon member is speaking in favor of. It is quite true that protection may be too little on some things and too much on others; for instance, I consider the duty on horses too high. I will tell hon gentlemen that a revision of the tariff was considered last year by a committee appointed by the late governor, and a majority of that committee, who were all business men, reported in favor of lowering the duties on agricultural produce, and there was a special report in favor of making Victoria almost a free port.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—That was the bogus Council, I suppose.

Hon Mr Hamley—they were a committee of gentlemen whom the late Governor thought fit to appoint. I think the tariff must be altered to suit the colony, but I believe it must be left to the Canadian Parliament to alter. What will our representative members do sitting in the Canadian Parliament, except to look after our interests? There is no obstacle that I know of to there being a different tariff to suit the interests of this or any particular Province of the Dominion.

Hon Mr Holbrook—There is no reason that there should be a similar tariff all over, but I think it must be altered by the Canadian Parliament.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I do not think that it is necessary that one tariff should prevail all over the Dominion.

Hon Mr Hamley—Not at all, not at all.

Hon Dr Helmcken—But there can be no differential duties, that is forbidden by English statutes.

Hon Mr Hamley—No; not by statute; by instructions.

Hon Dr Helmcken—So far from leaving it to the Canadian Parliament, I say we must go in with it settled. How absurd for eight members to attempt to revise the tariff of British Columbia in the Dominion Parliament.

Hon Mr Trutch—I don't see it.

Hon Mr Hamley—Nor do I.

Hon Dr Helmcken—Why, look how ridiculous it is to come to this House to propose any alteration in the tariff. How much more so in the Dominion Parliament, where so many would be on the other side. If at all, it must be done by ourselves. The Canadian Government must agree to it before we go into Confederation. The other interests are subsidiary to it.

On motion of hon Mr Ring, the debate was adjourned to Wednesday the 23rd.

## Wednesday, 23rd March.

Hon Mr. Wood rose to resume the debate on Tariff and said: Mr Chairman—In speaking to the motions now before the House, it will hardly be necessary for me to say that I think that this question of Tariff the most important of all that have been introduced during this debate; my object is, as I have said, to reduce to the utmost, in the event of Confederation with Canada, the chance of difference with the Dominion, my objection to Confederation being that, however much it may apparently and at first tend to confer upon the colony material benefits—yet there is every fear of consequent reaction and disaffection. In dealing with the matter it will be necessary to see whether the subject of Tariff now before us will have the affect of raising a direct question and difference between this colony and Canada. Tariff is not simply a mode of collecting taxes, it is a system with a double object. The object of obtaining revenue, and in the obtaining of that revenue, the further object of promoting domestic and home industries by a just discrimination between the subject matter on which taxation is levied. The question of Tariff directly tends to promote or depress domestic productions, and domestic trade, consequently the chances of difference and reaction depend on whether our interests are identical with those of Canada, or whether there is a conflict. The intended future Dominion of Canada is obviously divided so far as this question is concerned into two parts, that which is to the east and that which is to the west of the Rocky Mountains, the Atlantic and Pacific portions of that Dominion, and to these several divisions there appertain distinct and several industrial interests; agricultural, manufacturing, and commercial. Let us run through in our own minds, our own, the Pacific interests, so to say, the interests in fact of this present colony. First we have the agricultural interests; this is a material interest, as I trust it always will be considered in every colony—it is an industry which a government cannot well avoid materially to assist. I don't say "protect" but "assist," and this whether agricultural produce be a staple of the colony or not. I may here remark that I use the word "staple" in what I understand to be the received acceptation of the word—produce, exportable produce, raised in a colony with advantage and at a remunerative rate to the producer, and capable of being exchanged with advantage for the produce of other countries in the markets of the world. Our next material interests are our own staples, properly so-called as above defined, such for instance as the wool of Australia, gold anywhere, or fisheries, as in Newfoundland. Our particular staples are our fisheries, our forests and our minerals to say nothing of certain aptitudes for shipbuilding and the repairing of ships. Next, we must take trade and commerce, our local and geographical position being such as to give us some advantage in the distribution of goods, and as such is to be regarded as an element of wealth, and one of our material interests. Let us now turn to Canada; Canada has manufactures, but not by way of staples, because she cannot undersell the old world in manufactured goods, but with a population of, I suppose, over three millions she can produce sufficient manufactures of certain descriptions for her own use. Then her staples are agriculture, produce, lumber and a certain amount of minerals, and perhaps horns and tallow. Agricultural produce is a staple in Canada; she exports it, therefore it requires no protection; it would be no good to impose a tariff upon it. In manufactures there is such a tariff as will slightly protect manufactures, as with us we give the same turn of the market to the farmer by a slight tariff on agricultural produce. Following the common law of self-interest, British Columbia is bound to protect her own interests and Canada the same. Let us see whether or not there is a manifest tendency to protection in the Dominion Legislature. It has been stated in this debate that Canada is adverse to protection, that she wants to follow England and the old world in the direction of free trade. I say that those who make the assertion must prove it. (Hear, hear, from Mr DeCosmos.) I say that my sources of information tend to show that it is untrue that Canada favors free trade. She desires to protect her own manufactures. Right or wrong as a political theory, new countries will be found as soon as manufactures are possible, desirous to protect their own native industries, whereas it suits old countries to have free trade. In England manufactured goods are in reality her staples. England can compete with the world in most classes of manufacturing goods, from her manifest advantages in having coal and iron in close proximity, moderately cheap labor, and established industries; to say nothing of the commercial energy of her people. Some of the writers say that America and many of the colonies of Great Britain suffer from protection. I say that suffer or not suffer, they insist upon it. I say nothing now of my convictions. I think however, that the theory of free trade goes too far. "Free Trade" is quoted as if it were a golden rule. I believe that free trade is an exceedingly elastic idea, there is no orthodoxy in it, it is not a law of physics like the law of gravitation or some obstruse and elaborate theory like Sturn's problem or the stability of the eccentricity of the planetary obits, to which there is no exception. It is elastic and suits one country and not another; it suits old countries and not new; it suits England for the reasons I have stated. Her manufactures are her staples. She can undersell the world. People may say that free trade is applicable equally to other places and to all classes of industries; as to this I have my own opinions. But so far as this discussion is concerned, I deal with the world as I find it. New countries desire protection. Why? No matter why—they do desire it. Dealing with protection in a moderate way I think it may be reasonably conceded that a moderate protection, in the way of customs duties at least, may be applied to staple productions and agriculture. But whether the opinion be sound or not colonial experience shows us that this is the line of argument pursued and acted on. Taking it for granted as admitted by some political writers of eminence that we may reasonably protect staples until they can support themselves, let us see what legitimate protection may be afforded to existing interests in this colony. Agriculture may be protected or rather fostered in numbers of ways. By facilities for the acquisition of land, by roads, by immigration of farm hands, by the admission of implements free, and by a moderate tariff on produce. Agriculture, it must be remembered, is not only the cultivation of the land, it is bound up with local interests and carries with it a local population attached to the soil. If you want population localised you must encourage agricultural interests. Besides this, it must not be lost sight of, that it is a practical remedy against poverty. If a man has certain faculties for acquiring, or being employed as a labourer on land, he never need go to the poor house—it humanises men. It is the duty of every politician to protect agricultural interests in a new country to the best of his power. Now with regard to staples. I say they may reasonably be protected and fostered in their infancy, because they are the real wealth of the nation. It is said that at first the wool interest of Australia was carried on at a loss, and for a country like this that can produce without limit fish, lumber and coals, to say nothing of gold, we must give all the facilities in our power to induce industry in these walks of life. Take the gold miner; we might give him his gold license cheap, and make the acquisition of claims easy, provide him with roads and trails and in this way we might "protect" the miner, and encourage mining interests. Fisheries, how are they to be protected? By the promotion of information as to markets for fish—by pushing those markets—by local knowledge of the haunts of fish, by cheap implements, and by cheap salt. To promote the lumber interest we might give cheap machinery so far as we can by admitting it free, and let persons acquire land easily. Shipwrights might also be legitimately

protected and encouraged by making implements and materials cheap and by giving encouragement to Docks. Let us do everything to promote the interests of ships, where there are such natural inlets as ours, with coal at hand, and facilities for the importation of iron and steel for building ships, we could build cheaper than anywhere on this coast; not of course so cheaply as on the Clyde but still we might attract some shipbuilders. Now as to trade. Export trade. This is surely an item, though possibly a small item in our wealth; yet still if we export only to Puget Sound we might encourage such commerce. It is an industry and a source of wealth; it causes foreign ships to come and causes an expenditure of money in our ports; it adds to the number of merchants, drays and laborers, and increases general business; a vitality is given by it which makes it an element of wealth, it seems to have been beneficial here, and certain it is that it is estimated in this colony as a material interest. How is this export trade to be protected? Some say by Free Port, that is to say, no customs duties; others say "reduce taxation to a minimum on goods in which there is a tangible export trade." Within these limits of what we may call moderate protection we may reasonably suppose the colonists of British Columbia to be desirous to legislate, and suppose we desire to have implements of labour and machinery and some goods cheap and free, and put ten per cent on imported agricultural produce. This is the reverse of Canadian policy—as regards machinery, I believe the Canadian tariff gives fifteen per cent on manufactured machinery at least. There is nothing to prevent the Canadian tariff from being increased. Protection may run rampant in the Dominion. You have no guarantee. I say that in these fiscal questions we are at issue as affects some of our most important elements of national wealth. There would be a conflict, not only between the tariffs of British Columbia and Canada but between the protective policy of each province. How is this cause of discontent and conflict of interest to be removed? Why, by a British Columbia tariff for British Columbia. This place has no commercial connection with Canada. Canada affords us no market. There is no frontier to cause a difficulty with custom house officers. Why not have different tariffs. In the event of reciprocity with the United States we might be compelled to sacrifice the farmer, but possibly he might be in a condition to support himself by produce for which we have some special aptitude. Assuredly we shall have discontent or worse if the tariff is made oppressive, if we have for it to suffer the extinction or the disadvantage of our own industries. I have said hastily, give us our own tariff and I am almost in favour of Confederation. I think I must take that expression of opinion back. There are so many other matters, so many points of difference between us and Canada, that under any circumstances there would be a continual struggle with the other provinces. But however this may be, if you wish not to provoke and keep up a sore question have a separate tariff. Give to Canada and Canadian interests a tariff framed to meet their wants, and give to British Columbia its own especial tariff. If the tariff of Canada is to rule I fear it will never be altered, for the feeble voice of our eight members would never be listened to in the Parliament of Ottawa, and the Canadian tariff, framed for the support and maintenance of Canadian interests, would assuredly prevail.

The Hon. Chief Commissioner said—Sir, After the very able abstract review of the whole question of tariff customs and taxation of the hon gentlemen who has just sat down, I will not add anything by way of dissertation. But I must recall the house to the practical consideration of the subject. I acknowledge the ability of the hon and learned member, and quite agree with him that this is one of the most important matters connected with confederation. Then why, it might be asked, was it not touched upon in the terms? Not because it has not been fully considered, but because the Organic Act puts it virtually out of the power of the Colony to prescribe what form of tariff we should have under Confederation. The scheme as has been already pointed out by the Hon Commissioner of Customs is based on the transfer of the control of our customs to Canada, therefore it is not within our province under the scheme submitted, to impose on the Dominion, or even to propose any special tariff for this Colony, but this is a matter which is left up to for the consideration of the Colony on its merits, and is left open, as the hon member for Victoria has told you, for this Council to make suggestions as to what tariff may be desirable under Confederation. I take this opportunity to set right the impression which seems to prevail as to the liberty of government members upon this question. It is not left open to us to complicate the terms by inserting any condition as to make it in fact a sine qua non; but it is left open for this Council to suggest what tariff would be suitable for this Colony. The hon Mr Wood has discussed this matter on its abstract merits, as if it was in our power to dictate to Canada what tariff we should have; he has laid before this House very ably the pros and cons of tariff and free port. It is for us to consider what tariff would best suit us in or out of Confederation; but it is not allowed to us to prescribe to the Dominion what form of customs duties they shall adopt in this Colony, or in this province, as it will be. We have placed the control of the matter out of our hands. (No, no—Hons Humphreys and Wood). Well, sir, I believe we have; I say that view is imposed upon us by the terms, and I think it is better that it should be so; and for this reason. We, as being acquainted with the wants of the people, are best able to point out in what respect we need protection and where our interests are liked to differ from the tariff of the Eastern Provinces. But I believe, sir, that there are those in the Dominion whose larger experience and mature views will render them much better able than us to suggest such remedy as will be most beneficial. I am perfectly willing to explain my views on the subject of tariff and free port in the abstract, and the government invite the fullest discussion on the point both as regards protection to agriculture and manufactures, and free port. But I believe it will be better for the Colony to leave the decision and the remedy for the evils to those who will have the care of this province as well as the Eastern provinces. I think it will be in the interest of statesmen in the Dominion to treat this Colony well. Instead of feeling any want of confidence in those statesmen, I feel sure that every possible measure to promote the interests of this Colony will be well considered. They are in a better position to decide what will be most beneficial to this Colony even in regard to tariff. I would rather hear more opinions expressed before I offer a suggestion; it is my intention to offer a resolution in general terms so as to suggest to the Dominion Government that our agricultural interests must be protected and that certain things are required, and to ask the Dominion for such special provisions, in regard to tariff as we think we require. We are not in a position, after having endorsed the scheme of the Government, and after having handed over the sole control of the customs to Canada, to prescribe what tariff we shall have, or to impose conditions as to our local tariff.

Hon Mr Robson—Mr Chairman, while I consider the question of tariff one of very great importance, it does not appear to me that it necessarily forms any part of the terms. It is, in my opinion, futile to imagine that we shall obtain power, under Confederation, to frame and regulate our own tariff. The customs tariff is essentially a federal measure, and the Dominion Government cannot very well permit a province to make its own tariff. To do so would, in my opinion, be to admit a principle which would ultimately break up the whole Confederation. If such a concession were made to British Columbia every other province in the Dominion would forthwith clamor for it. The Dominion tariff is of necessity a federal matter, to be dealt with by the Federal Parliament, and it is unreasonable to expect that such an exception will be made in our favor. The customs tariff is the main source of federal revenue; and if any province were permitted to tinker with it the federal revenue would indeed be precarious. History does not encourage us to hope for such a power, taking into account the instances which, in this respect, present conditions not dissimilar to those of the Dominion, we find that the customs tariff has never been a federal question. To no state or territory has it been conceded to deal with its own tariff. If the strongest reasons had not existed for this, we should certainly have found exceptions made in favor of Pacific states and territories. Hon members will recollect the bitter complaints made in earlier times on this coast against federal tariffs; yet the people, while complaining, were never foolish enough to claim or expect the right to regulate their own tariff. They knew perfectly well that such a power was wholly incompatible with union. It is as well that we should not cling to any such hope as that of being permitted to make and regulate our own tariff under Confederation. I quite concur with the hon the Chief Commissioner in the view that, notwithstanding the difference in existing conditions on this side of the continent and on the Atlantic side of it, there are many questions even of tariff which would be more successfully dealt with at Ottawa, and that our representatives would be listened to and would have their due weight upon such questions. Probably through their influence the tariff would, in some respects, be made more conformable to our circumstances and interests; but the Dominion tariff must be altered and maintained by the Federal Parliament and not by any provincial authority. We occupy a very exceptional position and shall do so for years, in regard to such questions; and this might fairly be urged in asserting that the tariff of Canada, as a whole, is not applicable to British Columbia at present. But, sir, it would be to say that this question, like most others, has two sides to it, and has not been approached with that fairness and candor which its great importance demands. We are very apt to estimate protection above its real value—to forget the price we pay for it. Even our farmers sometimes pay more for protection than it is in reality worth to them. Under free trade the products of this part of the Colony commanded a much more ready market and higher prices than they do now after three years of protection. I am willing to admit that a few farmers have thriven, partly, perhaps, on protection, but partly, too, I am apt to think, at the expense of other classes and other interests in the Colony. Let us remember that protection is not an unmixed good and that it sometimes costs more than it is really worth. It should also be remembered that the importance of protection is somewhat localized in its application. Nature has given ample protection to the interior of the Colony; and it is, in reality, only on the island and the Lower Fraser that artificial protection can be demanded. I venture to think that there is a great future before Vancouver Island, but I do not believe that it will ever owe its greatness to agricultural development. I believe that its commercial, maritime, mineral and manufacturing industries will far outweigh its farming interests, and I do not think, therefore, that we would be justified in refusing Confederation upon fair and equitable terms, simply because we could not have power to regulate our customs tariff. I regret that I am unable to agree with many of the recommendations now before the committee. The wisest course, in my opinion, will be to ask the Dominion Government to withhold the application of the federal tariff of customs to British Columbia for a fixed period, say, until railway communication shall have been established through the Dominion to the Pacific. Until that takes place British Columbia must continue to occupy a position so isolated and so exceptional as to render the general tariff, however well adapted to the Provinces to the Eastward of the Rocky Mountains, scarcely suited to us. But with the opening of continuous railway communication these exceptional conditions will for the most part disappear. Look, for instance, at California. What a complete revolution the railway has wrought in the condition of that State. The moment the railway was opened California was no longer separated from the great commercial centres of the Eastern States by thousands of miles of sage-bush and desert. It was practically set down along side of them, or, to use the words of another, time and space were annihilated, and California became, for the first time, a fitting subject of a common tariff framed at Washington, and extending throughout the widespreading Union. Similar results will be realized in our own case. Upon the opening of the Canadian Pacific Railway British Columbia will practically be set down alongside of the Atlantic Provinces. We get over all constitutional difficulties by approaching the subject in this way. I do not say that the Dominion Government will assent to the proposition to postpone the application of their tariff to this colony until railway communication shall have been established; but we will approach them with a much greater show of reason and success in this way than in the other. I shall, therefore, propose an amendment or a recommendation, asking that the customs tariff of the Dominion be not ex-

tended over the colony of British Columbia until railway communication therewith shall have been established. Should this be agreed to on the part of the Canadian Government, it would then become our duty, upon entering the Dominion, to remodel our tariff with a view to protecting local industries, on the one hand, and building up our commercial and maritime interests, on the other. Canada might, possibly, sacrifice a little revenue in the first instance, but it would come back to her a hundred fold in the greatly enlarged prosperity certain to follow. In this way, also would be presented a living recognition of the necessity for railway communication, if not an incentive for the speedy consummation of that great desideratum. This course which I propose will more fully meet the local necessities of the country, while it will be more acceptable to the people, and, I feel assured, more likely to meet with the concurrence of the authorities at Ottawa. It possesses the advantages of accomplishing more good than can possibly be attained in the way proposed either by the hon member for Victoria District or that proposed by another hon member, and, at the same time of steering clear of constitutional difficulties.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—Sir, we have heard some very good and eloquent speeches. I intend to say a few words, and will begin with first principles: When the Confederation Delegates first met, they proposed to adopt a tariff similar to that of the United States—that the Federal Government alone should have the right to impose customs duties, that there should be no subsidies, and that each Province should raise its own revenue by direct taxation; but it was found that local governments were not favorable to direct taxation. At the Conference at Westminster it was at first proposed to give local legislatures power to make laws and impose direct taxation, but when the Organic Act was prepared that part was dropped out. I have desired to harmonise with the Organic Act; whatever we may do we should harmonize with the Organic Act, by so doing we shall meet with less objections at Ottawa. In looking at this question I may come to the conclusion that there is a possibility for the local government to raise taxes, but if it was referred to the Privy Council they might say it clashed. I will illustrate my meaning. I think the legislature of Ontario voted an additional sum to one of the judges; the Privy Council said it was unconstitutional to do so. So it might be if the local government imposed a tax upon foreign produce and manufactures. But we must not clash with the Dominion Government. In case the Dominion enacted customs laws lower than our own we would have the privilege to put direct taxes on those articles so as to give protection to them. Turning to the Year Book, I find that in New Brunswick the export dues on lumber amount to $70,000. This is an export revenue for a source of revenue. If the government of New Brunswick was able to except this item from the operation of the Dominion tariff why should we not be able to get the same sort of difference. The Canadian revenue will not suffer, every article will have to pay the Canadian tariff, and Canada will benefit by any prosperity that we enjoy.

Hon Dr Carrall—For how long do you propose to suspend the operation of the Dominion tariff?

Hon Mr De Cosmos—I have said indefinitely—possibly for ten or twelve years—we may have the railway completed by that time. The hon Mr Wood put the question properly. The tariff is a thing that is changeable, it rises and falls. Suppose that Canada has to raise six millions for a guarantee for the railway, they might have to raise the tariff. I think the tariff will probably rise for a long time. But this is aside the issue. My object in making this proposition is to prevent clashing between our local government and the Dominion. I include produce in my recommendation, which means stock, cereals, and vegetables. If a provision of that sort were added we would be in a position to get a certain degree of protection, and the largest interest, that is the agricultural interest, will be satisfied. But I maintain that beyond this we ought to protect certain rude manufactures; and in going into the Dominion we should go in with as little friction as possible; there must be some friction, but we must keep things as smooth as possible. There will be, as I have said before, a revolution in labor and value. Now, we do not want too much protection. Let our agricultural interests be satisfied and if those engaged in rude manufactures are protected the people will be satisfied. There are also a class engaged in trade who believe in protection; you will find then the agricultural interest, the manufacturing interest, and believers in protection, who will form a strong band of opponents to Confederation. Take away this subject of friction and you have the whole thing easier. If they are not considered there will be opposition before Confederation, and more after. If hon members desire to keep up a feeling of loyalty towards Canada after Confederation, they will protect these interests. With respect to the hon member for New Westminster his argument is no stronger than his weakest point, which is, [Hon Dr Helmcken—His resolution.] Well, perhaps this is the weak point; he admits the whole point. I do not intend to follow the hon member. I ask hon members to consider this question so as to consider industries and manufactures so that the the union may be lasting. I hope both sides will unite heartily in shaping our institutions with this end in view.

Hon Mr Ring—Mr Chairman, I only desire to drop a few hints. I say that the Organic Act is wholly inapplicable to this colony. Does the hon member for New Westminster mean to hand us over under this Organic Act to swell the coffers of the Dominion. I hail any approach to free trade; I believe in it; free trade should have as free a course as the wind. Now, sir, with regard to what has been said about protection to commerce; there are natural and artificial protections. I am for protecting the farmer by natural protections. Any attempt to shut out the surplus produce of another country must fail. The attempt to protect farmers by imposing a tax on flour and such articles is a mistake. Any protection beyond harbor and pilot dues is a vicious system. Then, say others, free port is abolished, would you go back to direct taxation. I say, how can we ascertain what the people can pay by taxing income and property. The revenue would be smaller, but it is now fictitious. We must curtail expenditure—and having done so I would abolish customs altogether as a source of revenue. I agree entirely with the proposition of the hon member for New Westminster that the tariff of the Dominion is a federal matter.

Hon Mr Humphreys—Mr. Chairman, I rise to support the recommendation of the honorable member for Victoria District. I have listened carefully to the lofty arguments of the Government appointees on this question. It appears to me that the mistakes which the English generally make are attributable to their reading and studying Great English writers too much instead of considering what is practically applicable to a new country. Old countries are, in this respect, very different to new. Free trade may suit England and other old countries, whilst it may act very perniciously in a new one. Even in old countries a large proportion of the people whom free trade is calculated to benefit are against it. But in new countries protection is absolutely necessary. It is said by some honorable gentlemen that the farming interests in the upper country needed no greater protection than nature had given them. I can mention an instance to the contrary. Flour was imported last year from California and sold in Cariboo at prices with which the upper country farmers could not compete. There ought to be some way of protecting the up country farmers without clashing with the interests of the Dominion. I think it but just and right to protect the farmers above all other interests. I look upon this question as next to responsible government and that I regard as the most important question in the resolutions which are before the Council; all others sink into insignificance beside these two conditions.

The Hon Commissioner of Customs—Notwithstanding that the local legislature after Confederation may not have a right to frame its own tariff what we hope is that the Canadian Parliament will deem it desirable for their own interests that a special tariff should be framed for this part of the Dominion. There is no law against this. It would not be a differential duty; it cannot be objected to on this ground. Differential duties are where the same articles from two different countries are charged differently. If the Canadian tariff was applied here taxation would be lessened. We must not lose sight of that fact. It would probably be lessened to the extent of $1,000,000 a year. I have estimated the difference upon one quarter's revenue, and I believe the difference to be at least $20,000 for the quarter. For all that, I think the tariff should be changed. A special tariff is required. I mentioned yesterday horses and cattle. I think the $15 on a horse and $10 on cattle would be a great hardship on this colony; it would amount to a prohibition. Last year 1700 head of cattle were imported into this city; are we prepared for the difference that the Canadian tariff would make in this item. I think the large duty would be most objectionable. With a tariff made especially to protect the farmers, over 40,000 pounds of butter were last year imported. If the Canadian tariff of four cents a pound were applied I do not know that much more could come in. I think that the farmers must have sold all they had. I think that advocates of protection do not apply the principles of protection to farmers of the upper country, but those of Vancouver Island the farmers will feel the weight of the protecting tariff without receiving any of its benefits. They will not feel the difference in the duty upon butter. I think that there will be a treaty of reciprocity between the United States and Canada, and I hope this colony will participate in it. It would be a great advantage. (Hear, hear!) I think the opening of the United States markets to our lumber would more than counterbalance the loss of protection on produce; I dont care for coal, they take as much as we can supply. I would suggest that this Council should send forward to Government a recommendation that we believe a special tariff desirable, nay, almost imperative. I do not believe that our eight members in the House of Commons, and four in the Senate of Ottawa, will have no weight; if so, they had better come back. What in God's name good will they do? I think the question may be safely left to the Canadian Government and our representatives at Ottawa.

Hon Dr Helmcken—With the view of bringing this to a vote I will propose this recommendation: That, in the opinion of this Council it is highly desirable that the agricultural, horticultural and dairy interests of British Columbia be protected; and I do this in order to divide the question into two parts. One honorable member wants the power of suiting the tariff to our convenience, and more than one honorable member has said that confederation must come. I deny it. There is no necessity that it should come now. If the people vote against confederation when the terms come before them. His Excellency will inform her Majesty's Government that the people don't want it.

Hon Attorney General—We have always said so.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I have so stated fifty times already.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I am glad it is so understood. The honorable gentlemen must be very careful to make the terms suit, for if the terms don't suit the people we shall not have confederation. I say that the people have been seriously told that confederation was to be the destiny of this colony. (No! no! from Messrs De Cosmos and Barnard) Efforts have been made to impress on the colony that we must have confederation on any terms. I do not consider that it is necessary for us to go in under the Organic Act. We did not expect to do it. To the honorable Collector of Customs I would say, that much stress is laid upon the fact that under the Canadian tariff the people will save $100,000; that is because the customs lose the people save. I say this does not follow. Canadian goods don't come here now because they cannot compete. The only reason they will be used is they will come in free, while others pay tariff. Possibly then the difference in price between Canadian goods and our goods may be very high; the Government may lose, but the people won't gain. Do you understand that? (No no! from Hamley and others.) People may have to pay as much for Canadian goods as for American goods now.

Hon Commissioner of Customs—American goods would come in less the duty now paid. Don't you see?

Hon Mr Wood—The difference of transport would prevent Canadian manufactures from coming here cheaper.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I say the tariff would be almost the same on these American goods then as now. I grant there will be a loss on agricultural produce; honorable gentlemen say they may send agricultural produce. Butter, I believe, comes from cows: it costs money to buy a cow; there is the difference between raising agricultural produce and cattle. If butter could be grown from the ground I don't suppose that forty tons would have been imported. Farmers are poor; they have not money to buy stock. Keep up protection and they will have money bye-and-bye to purchase cattle. Experience of the agriculturists in this colony has taught me that farmers with capital come out at the wrong end of the stick, whilst those who have gone in to work for themselves have made money. I know most of the farmers on Vancouver Island, and I find that those who began with nothing are doing well. The Hon Collector of Customs said that farmers in the upper country don't require a tariff. I went into that question yesterday, I think they will want it.

Hon Dr Carrall and Mr Barnard—Prices are getting too high now.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is exceedingly easy and pleasant for us who want to eat to say prices are too high, but let any man go to work on a farm and he will have experience of the difficulties. The Hon Collector of Customs says a treaty of reciprocity would be of great benefit, and that we might give up the farming interests of this colony for it. Now, sir, this Council said last year, almost unanimously, that agricultural interests must be protected. Why should honorable members think that we should require anything different under confederation. The honorable member for Victoria District almost led me the way in saying that irritation would arise which would lead to a desire for annexation if the agricultural interests were not protected.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—The interests we want to protect would be annihilated under confederation.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I say what we want now is what we want under Confederation. Now, sir, what have we been trying for. What has been our policy? why, to protect industry. I am told that the Dominion Government will not admit any alteration in our tariff and the example of the United States is cited. It has been said that California wanted to alter her tariff and was not allowed to do so. I say, in reply that California was one and a part of the United States. British Columbia is not yet confederated, so we are still in a position to make terms. California would have made terms if she could, but could not, and it was for a time a question whether she should not secede. It was only large subsidies and steam communication that kept California in the Union. There is this peculiarity in the Organic Act: section ninety-five enables Canada to make different laws as to agriculture in each different province.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I don't think that section applies to the tariff; it does not, so I believe it.

HON DR HELMCKEN—Perhaps it does not, but I say that anything advantageous to the colony may be enacted by the local government. We can ask for a separate tariff and Canada has power to make different laws as to agriculture in each province.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—No, that is a mistake. The 95th section weakens the hon member's argument.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I say it strengthens my argument. It does not mean merely that people may clean thistles out of their land. The simple issue is, shall agricultural interests be protected or no? It is quite possible that those who regulate the treaty, when brought into contact with Canadian statesmen, may devise some means whereby this result may be effected. I do not mean to give up to Canadian statesmen that they know more than ourselves about our local affairs, but I do think we may utilize their experience. I do not think that people, when they know that Confederation will not be forced upon them, will accept Confederation. The question for the farmers will be, shall agriculture be protected or not? I ask again, is agriculture protected by the resolution or not?

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—It is not a SINE QUA NON.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I think the idea to take a vote on protection to agriculture a good one, and I would rather that the resolution stopped there. Then I would propose a further resolution, pointing out the difficulties and the we labor under.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I accept that alteration. We shall by it procure an expression of the opinion of the Council upon this point.

HON MR DECOSMOS—I go further than that resolution. I stand here as a protectionist and I want to see the manufacturing interests protected as well as the agricultural interests. Protection will be a SINE QUA NON with my constituents. If the hon senior member for Victoria will divide the question into agricultural interests, manufacturing interests and trade, I will withdraw my recommendation. I say that we want this question settled before Confederation. As for reciprocity, it has, in my opinion, to be based on existing industry. The most important treaty of reciprocity was between England and Portugal, under which English goods were admitted into Portugal and wines into England. Reciprocity to be successful must be based on existing industries. If we enter into a treaty of reciprocity with the United States, we must build up our industries, such as coal. I take it that what our coal has to contend with is foreign and native coal in the San Francisco and Portland markets. Unless there is an extended market for coal it is impossible to [illegible]. Reciprocity would destroy the most permanent interests; that, for instance, of agriculture, and we would gain nothing by it. I say if Canada thinks proper to negotiate a treaty of reciprocity with the United States we should be at liberty to negotiate a separate treaty, or to insert special clauses in the treaty.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Let us clear the ground by getting the Chairman to put this resolution as an abstract proposition.

The CHAIRMAN then read the resolution as an abstract proposition for the vote of the Council.

'That in the opinion of this Council it is necessary that the agricultural, horticultural and dairy interests of British Columbia be protected.'

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Mr Chairman, I am prepared to vote for that Proposition, but I do not go quite to the extent of believing it necessary, although I think it very desirable. I don't think it of such importance as the hon members for Victoria City and District, as to make it a vital question or a SINE QUA NON of Confederation. I think it is desirable to continue protection under Confederation, and I do not see why we cannot. I think that the Dominion Government may, perhaps, be better able to provide the ways and means to effect that object than ourselves. We may not be able to provide a remedy, but we may advise. The protection that we ask for only partially affects the community. It is patent that it only affects Vancouver Island and the Lower Fraser at this time. (No, no, from Mr DeCosmos.) I say that the farmers of the Interior have a geographical protection. The time is distant when agricultural produce can come in to the upper parts of British Columbia or when the produce of the upper country can come into competition with the produce of the Island and of the Lower Fraser in these markets, without the cost of transport as equivalent to a protective duty, that before that time arrives the tariff may be amended again and again. With regard to what has been said about the closer union with a foreign country I said and I repeat it that if the interests of the farmers would be prejudiced under Confederation, they would be utterly annihilated under Annexation. I believe that if we were brought under the Dominion tariff they would be injured. I did not say that the Dominion would not give us separate tariff regulations. I think they will do so but I say we have put ourselves out of a position to prescribe. We have put before them a scheme, and we have left the tariff out of the scheme. We can now point out that we want protection, and leave it for the Dominion Government to point out the means. We have virtually put it out of our hands to dictate the means approved by this Council. I cannot agree in thinking that clause 91 leaves us free to impose our own tariff. I say we have made the British North America Act apply under the scheme which we have adopted under clause 10.

HON MR ALSTON—I differ from that.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—That is the whole strength of my argument. We have virtually given up the power over the tariff to Canada, but it is open to us and the Council are invited to state what is wanted. It must be remembered that those terms are only memoranda for Confederation. Different terms may be sent back, and it will be left for the new Council to decide upon them; and I, for one, am ready to suggest to the Canadian Government that we should have protection, although there are objections, for if you protect one interest another must suffer. We pay for the protection of produce in the increased price of the articles we consume. I go to the length of thinking it desirable to recommend the Canadian Government to protect our agricultural interests.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—I will ask the honorable mover of this recommendation whether he insists on the word 'necessary'?

HON DR HELMCKEN—I say this is one of those things that under Confederation will be necessary.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Will the hon member alter the word 'necessary' to 'very desirable'?

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—If you retain that word I must vote against it.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I retain the word.

HON MR ROBSON—'Highly desirable' would suit my views better.

HON MR DECOSMOS—I think the word ought to be retained.

HON MR ALSTON—I believe all restrictions are false in principle, and governments have no right to travel out of their path to dictate principles. It has rightly been said that protection to agriculture is at the expense of other things, and it is simply ridiculous to say that agricultural interests are the only interests in the colony. Vancouver Island cannot be looked upon as an agricultural country. I would vote for protection temporarily, but as soon as good roads are made the farmer needs no protection, and although free trade may be injurious to one interest, I believe it to be the correct principle. It strikes me that the Organic Act is a treaty of partnership between four countries, and where the terms are silent we can alter the Organic Act. If it be that we may make the laws, Canada still takes the revenue; and unless the resolution is altered I cannot vote for it.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I may clear the ground if I make a suggestion. I think it would be better to take the subjects separately, and then I would embody the whole matter in one resolution to His Excellency.

HON MR WOOD—It would be desirable to have as unanimous a vote as possible. The hon Chief Commissioner and the Hon Mr Alston have said that a tax on produce would be likely to prove injurious. I say that protection is only to be extended until our agriculturists can compete with the farmers on the opposite shore. If reciprocity should eventually arise, I do not pledge myself to support protection. It may be necessary then to make some compensation to farmers, but I cannot say I would support it.

HON MR DECOSMOS—We want a positive guarantee for protection.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER moved an amendment to change the word 'necessary' to 'highly desirable.'

The recommendation, as amended, was carried.

HON MR DECOSMOS moved a resolution, 'That it is highly desirable that manufactured articles should be protected.'

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I would ask the hon member to define manufactured articles.

HON MR DECOSMOS—I would name boots and shoes. Now in event of any reciprocity treaty, I should like to see our interests protected. A reciprocity treaty may exert a stimulating influence for a time or it may be detrimental. We have confectionary and many other things, for instance, there is a proposition to erect a woolen manufactory. Furniture at present all comes from the United States. Our cabinet makers could manufacture it here if they could import the raw material free. The same could be said of wheelwrights. If we are to have large public works we must have these interests protected. Harness may be brought in cheap under reciprocity, leather and soap likewise. I start out on this principle, if we can keep our manufactures at home we are doing our duty.

HON MR BARNARD—The Canadian tariff applies to all the articles mentioned by the hon gentleman; I am satisfied in regard to this protection. He says he wants protection for leather, and boots, and harness. Twenty per cent is our tariff on wagons, and yet no class of wagons, such as is wanted, can be made here.

HON MR DECOSMOS—We shall never have producing manufactures if we do not protect them. With regard to wagon building, parties now engaged in the business were about to leave until the tariff was introduced. Competition lowers the price of home manufactured articles.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I shall support this resolution; the Canadian tariff to some measure meets it.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—I shall ask to have the words altered.

HON DR HELMCKEN—Presently we shall have to protect British Columbian interests against Canadian interests. If the farmer and boot maker are protected, other local manufactures must be protected also. Where you do not produce things admit them free. It is our duty to protect our own interests.

HON MR BARNARD—And turn people out of the country.

HON DR HELMCKEN—You keep them in. You send out $100 000 a quarter for goods, which ought to be spent here. That $100 000 ought to be invested in mines and in building up the country. Now you want this country to be a garden and a manufactory. The people must do it, and it is the only way in which they can do it. Put your productions into competition with the whole world and you will ruin the producers throughout the whole colony.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER—Another question is, up to what point are you to protect? What is the use of protecting produce if you protect colonists out of the country? I put this as an abstract proposition. There is no more moot point than the difference between free trade and protection. I see the Canadian tariff protects these things, and I don't feel inclined to ask for more. Under the Canadian tariff agricultural products are almost free, but manufactures are protected. I don't intend to assume that the tariff will be taken off—that protection is to be taken away from manufacturers, for if so, it will be against the arguments of the members from British Columbia.

HON MR ROBSON—Some members are growing protection mad. They want to build a wall around the colony and keep out the entire world. You must come down to first principles. When honorable members talk about protection, I suppose we intend to protect that which we can produce. Are we to protect so as to force people into branches of industry unthought of before. Some honorable members have run to the extent of protecting population out of the colony; another favors protection in order to keep prices low, and thus to secure our population. I maintain that protection has run too far, and the agriculturists have not benefitted by it. [No, no! Mr. DeCosmos.] They tell me the demand is so small that prices are less. I am not in favor of withdrawing protection from farmers, but let us see that it does not go too far.

HON MR WOOD—Might I not turn the tables by judging some hon members are free trade mad; no one ever dreamt of such high

taxation. So far from sweeping off population we secure it, and in England free trade is intended to benefit the manufactures and it does so. It struck a blow at agriculture, and if they had not gone in to raising and spending more money it would have been an utter failure. High price for corn is now unknown; but free trade by way of dogma is absurd.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—there is a distinction between a tariff for protection and a prohibitory tariff. The hon Collector of Customs will set me right if I am mistaken, but I believe the importation of arms from foreign countries into a colony is prohibited.

Hon Collector of Customs—Prohibited, I believe, altogether.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—Precisely so; that the defence of the Colony may never depend on foreign aid. The hon Chief Commissioner asked the extent of the protection. I say during the infancy of the Colony. When we are able to run alone protection will be unnecessary. With regard to farmers wanting free trade, I deny it emphatically.

Hon Dr Helmcken—No doubt the Canadian Government will like this amendment of the tariff.

Hon Attorney General—I shall vote against it because it says it is expedient to arrange it in the terms. If the hon member alters the wording it would then become on the same footing as the last recommendation.

Hon Mr DeCosmos altered the wording accordingly, and on vote the motion was lost.

The motion of hon Dr Helmcken was put and carried.

## Thursday, 24th. March.

On the House going into Committee of the whole on the Confederation Resolution.

Mr. DeCosmos moved the following resolution "That in the opinion of this Council it is expedient in order to foster commerce, to admit, duty free, into this colony or some portions thereof certain articles of foreign merchandise not produced in the Dominion or this colony, and that provision for the admission of the same be made in the terms of union with Canada. In reply to a question the Hon mover said it would be impossible to name all the articles; but a few of them might be instanced, such as tropical fruits, silks and English dry goods; he thought this the proper time to bring these matters to the attention of the Dominion government, believing that they would listen to them. Some discussion ensued as to the mode in which the different recommendations and resolution were to be taken up.

The Hon Attorney General called hon members' attention to the fact, that it had been agreed by the House that an expression of opinion on these general principles; namely as to the protection of agriculture, of manufactures, and of commerce, should be taken, and that as had been very properly suggested by the member for Victoria District, a general resolution should be framed on these abstract views.

Hon Mr Robson—I shall offer an amendment, because I think the question of Free Port and Protection should not be dealt with together.

Hon Attorney General—The proposition of the hon member for Victoria district is as to what shall be admitted free; the hon member for New Westminster proposes to suspend the whole tariff.

Hon Mr Robson—I stated one reason why I thought it not desirable to put the two together. You cannot get the control of the tariff. I say we want free trade in certain articles, and I say we must have the tariff entirely remodelled as to these articles. My difficulty is that we were last evening discussing protection, and how far we should have the power to deal with it. I moved an amendment which was, I think, the only constitutional way of dealing with the question, and in answering certain propositions of hon gentlemen yesterday, I endeavoured to deal with protection *per se*. I listened with interest to what fell from the Hon Commissioner of Customs, and I do not like to set my opinion against his on matters of this kind, on which I know he is an authority, especially when I find him backed by the hon Attorney General and Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works. I instanced the United States of America, and said that they are a living instance of non-separation of tariff. The hon Chief Commissioner of Customs did not go so far as to say we could frame a tariff for ourselves, but that the Dominion Government would frame it for us. Now, Sir, I say that we must not run away with any such idea. If we were allowed to have a different scheme of revenue, Newfoundland would ask the same; New Brunswick, Prince Edwards Island and other provinces would all ask for exceptional tariffs, and the federal fiscal policy would be broken up and destroyed. Depend upon it we ought not to run away with such an idea. The Dominion government cannot admit of exceptional or differential tariffs any more than the United States can do so. Some hon members say that we are not under the Organic Act, and need not be under it, unless we choose, that there is a distinction between the relations of of the provinces that were confederated under the act, and those that may hereafter come in, and that we can change the Organic Act if we think proper. I admit that any province not prepared to come in under the Organic act can stop out. The act is not binding on us now, but will be if we go into the Dominion. I am surprised to hear some hon members speaking lightly of a reciprocity treaty. Look at the single item of coal. We at present only send 18,000 tons per annum to San Francisco. I have no doubt that under a reciprocity treaty, we should supply them with 60,000 tons a year at least, to say nothing of anthracite coal. In the course of a few years, allowing time for trade to develop itself, this would bring in $900,000 or, say, one million dollars a year into the Colony. Mr. Chairman, we are now speaking of a single item, and that, I believe, not the largest, which would bring in one million a year, and that calculation is based upon the present consumption of coal in San Francisco, and the consumption will no doubt increase. In addition to this, look at the quantity of shipping, and the cheap commodities which these ships bring in, which could hardly be brought as a measure of commerce. There are objectors to reciprocity. No doubt it would be very nice if we could open the United States ports to our goods, and close our ports to their goods. But this would not be reciprocity. There is, in my opinion, only one answer to be given. I say, give the farmers good roads, and this will be protection for them. Now, sir, what does the development of our coal interests mean; It means extension of labor, and circulation of money. Farmers have at once a full demand for their produce. Apply the same argument to lumber. Its developement would cause more money to be expended in the colony. Every ton of coal brought to the bank, and every tree cut down, means spending of money. There, then, is another field opened up for what farmers have to sell. Give the farmers this development and good roads, and they would soon find out that reciprocity would be like the handle of a jug, on the side of British Columbia. Depend upon it we will come in under the reciprocity treaty, and the advantages will be so great on our side that it will hardly be reciprocity. Nothing can be more unfair than to suppose we are to have a free market in the United States and they have none here.

Hon Collector of Customs asked if Mr Robson had any resolution to propose.

Hon Mr Robson said that at present he was replying to remarks that had been made by other hon gentlemen.

Hon Attorney General said that the course that the hon gentlemen was pursuing was embarrassing, and would tend to complicate the question before the House, and proceeded to correct a statement which he understood Mr Robson to have made as to what had fallen from the hon Chief Commissioner, hon Mr Hamley, and himself on a previous occasion as to the right to control tariff being in the Provinces after Union.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—Anyone who knows the history of the United States knows that if any question of dealing with the tariff law in any manner other than federal could arise, it would be in reference to groups of states instead of single states. I say then that we must consider this as a group of Provinces of the Dominion. Many years will probably not elapse before we see groups of states distinguished as Pacific and Atlantic, or East and West and North and South, in the neighboring Republic.

Hon Mr Robson—I rise to move a resolution. It is the same as that proposed at the Yale Convention by the hon member for Victoria District in 1867.

Hons Dr Helmcken and Attorney General.—What Convention? We know of no Convention.

Hon Mr Robson—I have a perfect right to allude to what took place at the little Parliament at Yale. I believe this to be the proper way to approach the subject. The resolution which I propose is as follows:

"That a respectful address be presented to His Excellency the Governor recommending that the following may be included in the conditions of the proposed terms of union with Canada: If at any time after the union, the Legislature of British Columbia shall pass an address to the Governor-General of Canada declaring that it is expedient to establish a free port on the Pacific in order to advance the interests of British commerce in the North Pacific, the Parliament of the Dominion to make provision for the establishment of the same."

It is astonishing to find what a change has come over the hon Mr DeCosmos since he changed his city seat for a rural seat. He is becoming less capable of taking a statesmanlike view of these things than he was two years ago. I think by providing that, the new council shall, after due deliberation find it desirable, that a Free Port shall be established in this colony is, after all, the proper way. I cannot think that this House, with the small representative element that it has should be asked to decide this point. I say that the tendency of the Canadian policy is in the direction of free trade. (No, no, from hon Mr DeCosmos.) I say it is, and there is a speech of Sir G E Cartier recently published, in which he says that the tendency of Canadian policy is towards free trade. Now I believe that a great British Empire is to be established on this continent,—the Greater Britain; and I believe that all British manufactures will be admitted free. If Great Britain takes her true part in pushing forward this Empire, she will naturally expect some advantages; she will naturally look for some immediate financial result. Every unproductive laborer in England is a tax upon the others; but transfer them to the Dominion and they will become producers and consumers. I believe it to be of the first importance that there should be a free port here, by a free port I do not mean that everything should necessarily be admitted free. There is no reason why local industries and especially agricultural interests should not continue to enjoy substantial protection. I believe the Canadian Government will readily realise the advantages of the policy of having a free port on the Pacific. There could be no local jealousies growing out of it. The provinces on the Atlantic could not object. Our free port would attract commerce and wealth to the nation which they could not possibly attract, and thus enrich the nation and reflexly benefit all. I maintain that while the larger advantages would be local, the general advantages would

be very considerable. I was gratified in reading a leading article in the *Ottawa Times*, the organ of the Dominion Government, in which the theory of a free port for the Dominion on the Pacific is strongly and ably advocated, and this article forms a complete answer to those who allege that the Canadian statesmen would never listen to any such proposition. If it should be decided that a free port would conduce to the interest of the Province and, consequently, to the interest of the Dominion, why should not we have it? Why should we object? What more glorious idea can there be than that of a British Empire extending across the Continent, with its back to the North Pole, with its face looking Southward. I will not venture to say how far; with one foot planted on the Atlantic and the other on the Pacific, stretching out one hand to Europe and the other to Asia, and inviting commerce of both hemispheres to enter its wide open portals, free as the wind that fills the canvas. Depend upon it, Sir, if this is to be the true north-west passage, the gates must be thrown open. Let us not repel commerce, but woo it. I venture to think that the resolution which I have the honor to offer proposes to deal with the matter in the most statesman-like way; and I trust it will commend itself to the judgment, and receive the support of all parties in the House.

HON MR HOLBROOK—Whilst believing that the establishment of a free port at Victoria might be beneficial to the interests of the Lower Fraser; did not think it would be for the general good of the Colony. In his opinion the agricultural interests wanted protection, for the present he must vote against the hon member for New Westminster. He thought that such questions ought to be left to the Dominion Government.

HON MR DECOSMOS—After the very, I will not say unusual, but unexpected remarks in reference to myself, I must crave the indulgence of the House while I say a few words to set myself right. Sir, I had something to do with the Yale Convention, and I am not ashamed of my connection with it; my political standard was unfurled then as it is to-day. When I first entered upon politics in this country I established a high political standard, which would take the measure of a political trickster as well as that of a statesman. There is nothing in the conduct of the hon member for New Westminster either here or at Yale to entitle him to the name of statesman. I say, sir, that I am as free as I was at Yale to vote for that clause, and if it can be got into the terms I will vote for it. I brought the question up at Yale because I knew that there was a party in Victoria favorable to free port, and I wished to see the question fought out after Confederation not before. The hon gentleman was defeated, he could not get the Yale Convention to endorse the retaining of the Assay Office at New Westminster, and he took his defeat very much to heart. (Hon Mr Robson—Untrue, untrue.) The hon member for Yale came to me and said: "You concede this point as to the Assay Office and I will yield the free port. We don't want Mr Robson to cave." That's how it came to be in the Yale resolutions. Since to this Colony I came I have never swerved from protection. In the first article I wrote for a newspaper in this Colony the word "protection" occurs. I want to see the Canadian revenue laws extended here; I want to see power in the local government to protect the industrial interests of the colony. I would like to know who has changed the hon gentleman's opinions. I spent my time and money in getting protection. I challenged a gentleman on the floor of this House to retire and I did retire. I hoisted the flag of protection and won.

HON MR BARNARD—I wish to state that what the hon gentleman said was true, except that he mistook the Hon Mr Robson for hon Mr Holbrook.

HON DR HELMCKEN—We are here to remedy evils likely to occur from Confederation, evils which are admitted by every member of this council. That there is an evil even the hon member for New Westminster has admitted. (Hon Mr Robson—No.) The hon gentleman makes his net so wide that he slips through; but he said in effect that the difficulty was irremediable and to get out of it he proposes not general free trade but free trade in certain special articles. If the Canadian Government can agree to one they can to the other. I believe that if we show the Canadian Government that the Canadian Tariff would be an evil, they will find means to remove the evil. I believe a tariff fair and suitable to this colony will be made. I believe we have gone so far right; we have resolved that our agriculture shall be protected. Now comes the question as to commerce: we want articles of commerce as cheap as possible; our trade is chiefly retail, nevertheless it is important and should be fostered. I think that everything we can do to increase the population of this country is of importance, I therefore propose this resolution:

"That in the opinion of this council it is advisable that after union foreign manufactured articles in which trade can be carried on with neighboring countries shall be admitted into this colony at a low nominal rate of duty, and generally the tariff should be made to suit the commercial condition of the colony."

I think free trade to Vancouver Island would be beneficial with protection to agriculturists, but I do not think it desirable except in a limited way. Does anyone imagine that if free port was restored to Victoria her prosperity would return? In more early days, when she enjoyed free port there were not the obstructions to free trade with the neighboring country that there are at present. Now there are custom House officers to prevent smuggling and a great deal of illicit trade is checked. With regard to free trade: in former days we were far more advanced than the people on the Sound; to-day, on the Sound, trade has so far increased as to be almost equally as good and I am told you can buy goods almost as cheaply as in Victoria, so I do not believe free port would restore our pristine prosperity. Under free trade it is supposed that large stocks of goods will come by Panama or by long sea route. But look at the altered condition of things resulting from the Pacific railway and the railway to Columbia river, and probably on to Puget Sound. Do you imagine anyone will send large stocks of goods to lie here? and will not people telegraph for whatever they may require, and bring them across the continent by railway? I say that the same prosperity and trade that we enjoyed before would not come back. We are told that when the railway is made a large trade will come across but I doubt the railway being made in our time, and if it is, ships will go wherever the railway terminus is and that will not be here. It would be an advantage to have some articles free, silks, trie traca, &c. Make Victoria the Paris of the coast and we may do something. And this brings me to the observation of my hon friend on my right, that more frequent steam communication with the Sound would be productive of much good to trade. What I want to say is that the persons going to negotiate these terms ought to be able to state that this colony requires restrictions in the tariff. I do not intend to be factious, but I do intend to show to the Canadian Government what we consider best for this country, and that without certain terms we believe Confederation will be bad. What use is it to attempt to deceive Canada? She knows what is being done, and if not there are those here who would tell her. It is our duty to show the Canadian Government that there are things we desire. Of what use is the country to Canada unless it is populated? She wants people not terms. We must show what will be the advantages of Confederation. If the Tariff of the Dominion must come here it will be unsuitable to us—an admitted evil. If this cannot be remedied Confederation is likely to be put off for years. I merely mean to elicit the feeling of this House on the subject of whether we can take off certain duties. If commerce can be protected in the way we desire, as we shall see when the persons who go to arrange the terms come back, then it will be no use to oppose Confederation; if the evil is still to exist, then there will be opposition.

HON DR CARRALL—I shall vote against the resolution. With regard to free port I do not say I am opposed to it or in favor of it; but I do say that the Canadians will say if we pass this resolution, "What kind of people are these that pass a resolution yesterday in favor of protection, and to-day desire free port?" The honorable member for Victoria city proved forcibly, I will not say conclusively, that free port would not be beneficial. This reasoning is inconsistent, and it is eminently characteristic of the honorable gentlemen.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I desire to explain the terms of my resolution—the latter part. If the Canadian tariff rules our farmers are ruined.

HON DR CARRALL—Vancouver Island can never be an agricultural country.

HON DR HELMCKEN—Bring the Canadian tariff here and you take away protection and tax the farmers for all they consume.

HON CHIEF COMMISSIONER OF CUSTOMS—A free port is an impossibility unless the English Parliament repeal the Act of Union. This act enacts that British Columbia tariff [illegible] shall prevail.

HON DR HELMCKEN—I believe a free port could be carried on if you could wall in an acre or two of this city and not do any injury to manufacturing interests or any other interests. I mean to say that upon that acre people might expose their goods—make it one large bonded warehouse.

HON DR CARRALL—We have heard of the pernicious effects in prospective of the Canadian tariff. I maintain that it will protect the principal, that is the pastoral interests, better than what is proposed by some honorable members. The admission of cereals free will be counterbalanced by the additional protection afforded to the farmers' horses and cattle and the cheaper rate for goods.

HON ATTORNEY GENERAL—I wished to gather the opinion of the House before expressing my opinion on this question. I regret much and am sure that this House will join with me in a feeling of regret that my honorable colleague the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works is, unfortunately, absent from his place on account of indisposition, for I am aware that this is a subject to which he has given much consideration and I would have been glad that the House should have had the benefit of his opinion on this very serious question, for it is impossible to approach the subject without feeling its vital importance, and I think it would tax our united will and energy to their utmost limits, if we had the power, to frame a tariff which would be suitable; therefore I see wisely in all the resolutions a wide generality. Upon this question of tariff we must especially avoid attempting to commit the Dominion Government to any fixed principle. The tariff cannot be part of the terms, but it is undoubtedly a matter of consideration to be urged on the Canadian Government. Though we have assented to the Organic Act we have not shut our elves out from going to the Dominion Parliament to ask for remedies which they can give to us, and to ask them to find a remedy which will make confederation acceptable to this colony. Therefore I think, with the honorable Chief Commissioner, that one general resolution upon this subject, after dealing with the three separate resolutions or abstract principles, may with advantage be passed by this House. I think, also, with that honorable gentleman, Mr. Chairman, that Canadian statesmen who will have to deal with this matter will do so with wisdom. They, in considering the terms when other provinces have entered the confederation must have experienced some of these difficulties which now come to us for the first time. No doubt many hon members of this House have given great consideration to this question, yet I think that Canadian experience will help us. Much has been said on Free Port, much for and against. My own tendencies, since first I had a seat on this floor, in another assembly, have been in favor of free port. I voted for it then, but I feel that I am obliged to vote against it now. The Imperial Government will not sanction anything which is in effect a differential duty in the same tariff but this is distinct from the question of a separate tariff for British Columbia. Other considerations will naturally strike Canada and I think if free port was made a sine qua non she would refuse Confederation altogether, as she would not like to run the risk of entering into difficulties and disputes of a fiscal character with her great and powerful neighbor, which might possibly arise out of smuggling. Another difficulty in dealing with this matter that we have to encounter is that we have information that a reconstruction of the Canadian tariff is at present going on, and there is some chance of a reciprocity treaty being arranged, therefore we cannot put forward any fixed principles. The main objections of the Dominion to a separate tariff it strikes me, will be found to be: first that they are afraid of infringing a principle; and, second, the introduction of a precedent for a special tariff, which might cause Newfoundland and New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and other Provinces to ask for special tariffs to suit their particular circumstances and to avoid the inconvenience of possible hostile tariffs. There are certainly many plausible reasons to be found in favor of a special tariff for British Columbia, such as the difficulty of communication, the want of either road or railway and the security against smuggling into Canada. But the probability is that protection to commerce would be secured by the reconstruction of the Canadian tariff, and I regard the framing of a tariff now which would apply satisfactorily to our altered circumstances under such a thorough change as Confederation would bring, as a matter of impossibility. Formerly, when there was a free port at Victoria, it was always in danger and the hon senior member for Victoria City, then the Speaker of the Vancouver Island House of Assembly, was always afraid of every little impost on stock or produce lest it should infringe upon the principle of free trade, and at last it was so loaded with dues and charges that before the union the principle of free port was destroyed. But I see no reason why, when we

are going into a partnership, we should not arrange the best terms we can and I think that the differences could be altered in favor of this colony, and in favor of Confederation generally. We have no power ourselves, that is the reason this question is not brought up in the terms. We must see what effect union will have on this colony first—we must see how the thing works before we decide finally. At the same time we must take care that we protect such important interests as agriculture and commerce from haste or injurious delay. I will, therefore, as soon as the terms are settled propose a resolution which will meet this difficulty and give time to see what change, if any, the country may require. In sending our resolutions to the Canadian Government we must not suppose that we have exhausted the subject. Many points must arise when the Canadian commissioners come here, or ours go there—if the matter take that turn—but we should be careful not to overload the terms lest we should endanger the cause of Confederation altogether. We must have some faith in the Dominion Government—in Canada and Canadian Statesmen. We must not forget that their own interests would be ours. I say nothing with regard to the latter part of the resolution of the hon member for Victoria City except that it does not accord with his usual statesmanlike views. I shall offer no opposition to the latter part of the resolution of the hon member but I cannot support the whole. If anyone will move an amendment to leave out the latter part, I will support it.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—We have three propositions now before the House; my own, and those of the hon members for Victoria and New Westminster; the former divides the subject. I think they would both act judiciously if they withdrew the question of free port.

Hon Dr Carrall moved an amendment to strike out the latter part of the resolution of hon member for Victoria.

Hon Mr Ring suggested that the amendment should be deferred. These amendments so qualify the general principles that I must decline voting for any one of them.

Hon Mr Wood—Sir, I do not intend to express my opinion on free trade or protection but I intend to vote; and I think my hon friend (Mr Ring) might consider that he is not pledged to any particular course by his vote. I give my vote in order that the question may be brought before the Canadian Government, and ultimately before the people of this colony.

Hon Mr Ring—I have great respect for the opinion of the hon and learned gentleman, but the resolution of the hon member for New Westminster pledges us to the Organic Act, which I decline to endorse. We are entitled to our own free port and to the regulation of our own tariff.

Hon Mr Robson—I hope the hon member will remain while I set him right. My resolution only asks that a Representative Council here, after due deliberation shall have power to decide upon this question. I consider that the name of free port is attractive, this, under the resolution of the hon member for Victoria District, we should lose. We must not regard the Canadian tariff as entirely unprotective. It is wrong. It is untrue to state that the Canadian tariff is such a great evil, and I maintain that it would not be an evil, but an actual good, but that is no reason we should not seek to make it a greater good.

The Clerk read the resolution of hon DeCosmos, the amendment of hon Robson, the amendment of hon Helmcken, and the amendment of hon Carrall.

By the leave of the Committee the amendment of the hon Mr Robson was withdrawn, in order that it might be brought up as a substantive motion.

On a division the motion of hon Dr Carrall was carried, and the original resolution of Mr DeCosmos was lost.

The hon Mr Robson then moved his resolution, to which the hon Mr Humphreys moved an amendment.

Amendment and resolution were lost.

Hon Mr Drake—Sir, I rise to move this resolution on Excise:

"That in the opinion of this Council the duties of excise levied upon maltsters and brewers under the excise laws of Canada would be detrimental if made applicable to British Columbia, and that His Excellency be requested to take such steps as he may deem advisable for the interest of this colony, and further to take care that no export duties shall be charged on spars exported from British Columbia."

And I would remark in doing so that excise as levied under the Canadian system, is very heavy indeed; there is duty, license and excise. The result would be to the brewing interest in all probability total extinction; for on an increasing trade the duty would be so high as to check trade in this direction. The other part of the resolution is in respect to logs, the duty on which is $1 per 1000 on saw logs, but whether a spar or a mast it is regarded still as a log. Thus the Canadian tariff would seriously interfere with our industry and interfere with getting out masts and spars.

Hon Dr Carrall—I think the hon and learned member for Victoria city is under a misapprehension when he includes spars with logs. If the Tariff refers simply to saw-logs, I cannot see that the spar business would be affected.

Hon Attorney General—I must confess, sir, that I do not see the object of this clause. I don't think there is any need for alarm. I have lived for some years in Canada, and when I think of the Canadian statesmen, who will look at British Columbia without regard to party politics, such men, for instance, as Sir J A Macdonald, Sir Francis Hincks, Sir A T Galt, Mr George Brown and the various statesmen accustomed to deal with these things, I feel confident that we are safe in their hands; therefore I hope that the hon and learned member will not imagine that in voting against this motion we are voting against the interests he so properly wishes to protect.

Hon Mr Ring—The hon Attorney General seems to think that these honorable men may live forever. He forgets that in the progress of time other men will take the lead in public affairs.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is a most important question. The Canadian Government ought to know what we think of it. The brewing interest would disappear, and it is large in proportion to our population, and to ruin it would be doing an injury. I hope the hon Attorney General will withdraw his opposition and let this recommendation go with the others to the Governor that he may forward it with them to the Canadian Government. At the time the Organic Act was made it related to contiguous Provinces. The hon Attorney General says they may not put it in force here for ten, twenty or thirty years. Granted, but it may also be put in force immediately. I say, then, let the Canadian Government be made aware that the application of the excise laws to this colony will be detrimental to its interests.

Hon Dr Carrall—I think the hon member loses sight of one fact. He is terribly afraid of the Canadian tariff but he loses sight of the fact that barley comes in duty free. I believe the whole system will be carefully revised, and it is absurd to hamper the terms of the resolution for such a petty question.

Hon Mr Drake—In reply, I think our duty in coming here is to protect the interests of the colony. We ask the Dominion Government to consider these things. We do not insist on terms being inserted. I do not ask for this only, I desire to draw the attention of the Canadian Government to these interests that they may not be overlooked. As to these interests being petty and small, that is our misfortune; but let us not lose sight of them for that reason. As for Americans coming here to cut down our logs, I say let them come. If I can alter my resolution to suit the Attorney General I will do it.

Hon Attorney General—If I thought the interest of the colony would suffer I would consent to bring the subject before the Canadian Government, but I think we have nothing to fear.

Hon Dr Helmcken—If you ruin the brewing interest, you inflict much harm in other ways. Brewers consume one million pounds of barley yearly. This is 700 acres of land which must be cultivated. To ruin this will throw out of employment a large number of people and close up our breweries.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—I see no objection to sending this up but not to make it a SINE QUA NON. I believe the Canadian Government will protect all these interests. Brewing is not of sufficient magnitude to kill Confederation.

Hon Mr Robson—I must oppose if logs are left in. I think it may be our duty to protect spars and logs.

Hon Mr Drake—Then I will strike out logs and leave spars.

The Clerk then read hon Mr Drake's motion, as altered. Carried.

Hon Dr Helmcken—There are other things to be considered.

Hon Attorney General—I think it is now competent for me to move the resolution proposed by the hon Chief Commissioner.

Hon Mr Robson—Is it intended that this shall swamp all the others?

Hon Attorney General—No, it relates only to tariff:

'Resolved that this Council respectfully represent to His Excellency the Governor that in negotiating the terms of union of British Columbia with Canada, it is of the first importance to point out to the Government of the Dominion that the circumstances of this colony are in many respects so different from those of the Eastern Provinces that the application of the present Canadian tariff to this colony, while reducing the aggregate burden of taxation, would injuriously affect the agricultural and commercial interests of this community, and that it be therefore urgently impressed upon that Government that it is absolutely necessary to our wellbeing under Confederation that special rates of Customs duties and special Customs regulations be arranged for this colony in such manner as may be found practically most advisable, so as to secure, while our requirements in this respect remain as at present an equal measure of protection to our agricultural products and of facility to commerce, as are provided under the existing British Columbia tariff.'

The resolution was carried unanimously.

The original motion of the hon Mr DeCosmos on the Orders of the Day was read and by leave withdrawn.

Hon Mr Drake's motion was also withdrawn.

Hon Mr Holbrook's motion was put and lost.

Hon Mr Robson's motion was put and lost.

Hon Mr Humphreys moved,

'That in the consideration of the subsidies to be given by Canada to this colony due weight shall be given to the advisability of abolishing the present road tolls on the Yale Cariboo road, and also to make provision for funds to keep the same in repair.'

I put this in consequence of the suggestions thrown out by the hon Chief Commissioner. I think these roads have done more towards making bankrupts than any over trading. These are main trunk roads and I think they ought to be kept up by the Dominion Government.

Hon Attorney General—I am not aware that that is the result of any suggestion of the hon Chief Commissioner. I am aware of his views, and I believe he has doubts as to whether roads can be maintained by a Government so far removed as Canada.

Hon Mr Barnard—I would suggest that this be laid over till the hon Chief Commissioner be here.

Hon Attorney General—The hon Chief Commissioner would not object to any conclusion of the House on this matter. But I caution hon members not, by the addition of these suggestions, so to overload the resolutions as to break down the whole of them.

Hon Mr Barnard—I move that the Committee rise and report progress, in order that the matter may be laid over until the hon Chief Commissioner is in his place.

Committee rose and reported progress.

---

FRIDAY, March 25th.

---

On Mr Humphrey's motion on roads being read the Hon. Attorney General said:

I regret to say that my honorable colleague, the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works is still too much indisposed to attend to his place in this House. I would, therefore, suggest that the honorable member should postpone this notice until he is present.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I have no objection to defer it on the understanding that it come up on Monday.

Hon Attorney General—On Monday, or this day, if the Committee go through with their other motions on Confederation.

Hon Mr Ring—I desire to introduce a motion with regard to free port, but I do not intend to inflict upon the House a speech. I move that His Excellency be respectfully requested to place in the terms a clause to restore to Victoria the system of free port antecedent to confederation. The honorable member for New Westminster was indignant with me yesterday for not supporting his resolution. I only say that his proposition was hypocritical. I ask that we may have free port restored before confederation. We have now the right to legislate for ourselves on this point. Hereafter we shall be at the mercy of the Canadian Parliament at Ottawa. I would make free port one of the conditions of confederation, but first restore free port.

On the Clerk reading the first words of the resolution,—

Hon Dr Carrall—I rise to a point of order. I say that this question has been already decided.

Chairman—I think the honorable member for Nanaimo is not out of order on that point. The question of free port yesterday related to free port after confederation. The resolution of the honorable member for Nanaimo is in reference to free port antecedent to confederation.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—The the honorable member is surely out of order, this Committee having met to consider confederate resolutions.

Chairman—I rule that the Hon Mr Ring is in order, as his resolution refers to the terms of confederation now before this

committee. On the honorable Mr King's motion being put to vote it was lost.

Hon Mr Holbrook—I have very great pleasure in bringing this resolution forward with reference to the Indian tribes.

Hon Attorney General—I ask the indulgence of the honorable member whilst I interpose a few words. On a former occasion a very evil impression was introduced in the Indian mind on the occasion of Sir James Douglas' retirement. I ask the honorable gentleman to be cautious, for Indians do get information of what is going on.

Hon Mr Holbrook—My motion is to ask for protection for them under the change of government. The Indians number four to one white man and they ought to be considered. They should receive protection.

Hon Attorney General—These are the words that do harm. I would ask the honorable Magisterial member from New Westminster to consider.

Hon Mr Holbrook—I say they shall be protected. I speak of Indians of my own neighbourhood, on the Lower Fraser.

Hon Mr Robson—I rise to a point of privilege. I think that the warning of the Hon Attorney General is necessary. This is the sort of discussion which does harm.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—Don't report it.

Hon Mr Holbrook—I do not view it in that way. I say that the Indians of the Lower Fraser are intelligent, good settlers. I ask that they receive the same protection under confederation as now.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I would ask what protection they have now.

Hon Mr Holbrook—They have protection in being allowed to occupy lands, and they enjoy equally with white people the protection of the law, and I ask the House to keep them in the same position.

Hon Attorney General—If the Indians had no better protectors than the Hon Magistrate from New Westminster, I should not envy them their protection. The honorable gentleman must have forgotten the direction of the Imperial Government to his Excellency the Governor, in Lord Granville's despatch.

Hon Mr Robson—The Hon Mr Holbrook has told you that he speaks in behalf of 40 000 Indians. I speak in the name of 65 000. I am inclined to think we should not pass this matter over entirely. We ought to point out our desire that the Indians should be cared for. Now, the Canadian Indian policy has been characterized as good, even by American statesmen. Our own policy is not worth the name. I consider it to be a blot on the Government. I will, therefore, propose as an amendment the following:

That the Indian policy of Canada shall be extended to this colony immediately upon its admission into the Dominion, and that the necessary agencies and appliances for an efficient administration of Indian affairs may be at once established.

The Canadian Government occupies the position of guardians to Indians. They are treated as minors. There is a perfect network of Indian agents in Canada, and through them the Indians are made presents of agricultural implements, seeds and stock. Now, if we let it go forth to the Indians that their interests are being considered, and that this will be greatly to their advantage, I say, by making the Indians feel this, there will be less danger of exciting any unpleasant feeling among them. We should set the Indian mind at rest and let them feel that Confederation will be a greater boon to them than to the white population.

Hon Dr Carrall—I rise to state my intention of voting against the resolution and the amendment. We have the full assurance in Lord Granville's despatch that the Indians must be protected. I do think the honorable gentlemen are only hampering the resolutions trusting to overthrow the whole system. The honorable member for New Westminster has affirmed how good the Canadian system is. The goodness of that system is in itself sufficient to render the resolution needless. I shall, therefore, vote against it and the amendment.

Hon Mr Holbrook—I must vote against the amendment.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I disapprove of what both the honorable members stated. These gentlemen know nothing of the question. I will show you you why. Take away the Indians from New Westminster, Lillooet, Lytton, Clinton, and these towns would be nowhere. I say the Indians are not treated fairly by us, and all they want is fair dealing from the white population. At Lillooet I was told there were upwards of 16 000; and $17,000 gold dust was purchased from Indians. Take away this trade and the towns must sink. I say, send them out on reservations and you destroy trade, and if the Indians are driven out we had all best go too.

Hon Mr Robson—The honorable member for Lillooet says that the Canadian policy will ruin the country and the Indians. I say, then, to be consistent, he must move an amendment that it shall not apply. To say that the Canadian policy will ruin the country shows simply ignorance.

Hon Mr Barnard—I am convinced that the Hon Attorney General is right.

Hon Mr Alston—I must support the honorable member for New Westminster. I say there is no Indian policy here, and I am sure that the Canadian policy is good.

Hon Mr Robson—I was induced to put an amendment because there is a resolution, otherwise I would not have interfered.

Hon Attorney General—My esteemed colleague the Hon. Registrar General says we have no Indian policy. I say our policy has been, let the Indians alone. (Hon Mr Alston—No, no!)

Hon Mr Barnard—The reason I ask for the withdrawal of the resolution is that we cannot keep back from the Indians anything that has been said here, and it will have a bad effect.

Hon Attorney General—As these words may go forth, I wish to state on behalf of the Government that the care of the Indians will be the first care of the Imperial Government and of the local Government.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I do not apprehend any danger from any discussion in this House.

Hon Mr Alston—I suggest the withdrawal of the resolution.

Hon Dr Carrall—I say that the Canadian policy has caused them to grow and prosper. I am at a loss to understand why honorable members should be afraid to trust to it.

Hon Dr Helmcken—The honorable member for Cariboo seems to find it difficult to understand my position. I think it right to endeavor to get the best terms we can, and to point out difficulties. It is the duty of every man to do so. I am perfectly willing to sit here and make the best terms possible. When they come back from Canada it will be time enough for me to decide whether or not I shall support Confederation. I am now anti-confederate, but I may become a confederate if the terms are good. I say if the Indians are to be sent on reservations there will be a disturbance. I think, sir, that it will be well that there should be some opposition.

Hon Mr Robson—I wish to state I will withdraw my amendment if the honorable member will withdraw his motion.

Hon Mr Holbrook—I can not do so consistently with my duty.

The amendment was withdrawn.

The resolution of the Hon Mr Holbrook was lost by a vote of 20 to 1.

Hon Mr Robson moved that an address be presented to his Excellency the Governor, asking that Canada shall cause a geological survey of this colony to be made, commencing within one year after union. He said that a fund of $100,000 had been set apart by the Canadian Government for the specific object of carrying out a systematic geological survey; that sum to be spread over a period of five years. Canada had the good fortune to possess a very efficient geological staff. The Red River country had received the first year's survey under that arrangement, and would probably receive the second this year. British Columbia will possess a greater mineral interest than any other province, and a thorough geological survey will be of the utmost importance to her, and reflexly to Canada, and it was not too much to expect such a survey to follow close upon union.

Hon Attorney General—I am sure no one can have the slightest objection to support a motion for a survey. I assure you it has not escaped the notice of Government, but I regard it as a matter of certainty that British Columbia will come in for her share. I do not object to the consideration of the question between this Government and that of Canada, but I do object to inserting it in the terms. I think it may lead to the danger of the Canadian Government saying, when other things come to be considered, "You don't want this, it is not mentioned in the terms; had you really required this it would scarcely have been omitted in terms so full as these."

Hon Mr Robson—In reply, I say that the Government has inserted a number of special things in the terms; and with reference to the geological survey, I believe Newfoundland got this very matter inserted under the direction of Governor Musgrave.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I rise to support the motion. I cannot understand the opposition. (Hon Attorney General—I don't oppose; divide, divide, divide.) I desire to show the necessity for a geological survey. We are now eleven years old as a colony, and nothing is hardly known of the country. We are behind our neighbors of the United States. In California there is a Geological Surveyor, who has to explore and publish the result of his survey. We should have something of the sort here, and in addition a record of the number of available acres of land in the colony. If 25 or 30 farmers arrived here I would undertake to affirm they could not get any information from the Land Office as to where they could settle down.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I should not like that statement to get abroad uncontradicted. I think these assertions should not be made; they are likely to do much harm. I should like to see the 25 or 30 farmers come; let them go to the Mouth of the Fraser. There may be some difficulty about getting land in any part or locality, but it is absurd to bring up this fuss about the Land Office.

The resolution was put to the vote and carried.

Dr Helmcken moved that it is desirable that the Dominion Government shall maintain telegraphic communication with this colony.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is absolutely necessary that there should be some telegraphic communication with the outer world. It is palpable that we must have it with the seat of Government.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—It will be in the recollection of some of the hon members that, some years ago, a question was sent out for discussion from the Secretary of State as to the payment by Vancouver Island of a subsidy towards the Transcontinental Line of Telegraph. She could not afford it. Canada has the wire now taken over from the Hudson Bay Company. I shall support the resolution. I do not regard it as a SINE QUA NON, but very essential. I have no doubt Canada will do it.

Hon Mr Robson—I understood the hon member for Victoria city intended to ask the Canadian Government to maintain the existing telegraph line which runs through a foreign country.

Hon Attorney General—From the general wording of the resolution I am at a loss to know what is meant. I think this is a matter which had best be left out, or we shall be overloading the terms. If I vote against it, it is because we have fully too much in the terms.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—Why did not the terms come down to us more perfect?

Hon Dr Carrall—I am sorry the resolutions did not come down more perfect, but if they had been ever so perfect hon members would have found fault. I look upon the conduct of hon member, in bringing forward the additional resolutions as being inimical to confederation.

Hon Mr King—I shall support the resolution. I think our cure will enhance our value in the estimation of Canada.

Hon Dr Helmcken—It is admitted that if we are to have union we must have telegraphic communication. Why it was left out I don't know. It must have slipped out, for it was before the Executive. Surely hon members will not have the idea that $3000 or $4000 inserted here will touch confederation.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—$3000 or $4000?

Hon Dr Helmcken—At present, yes. The only means of communication is through America.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—I thought this was a trans-continental telegraph. I am sorry I said anything about it.

The Chairman then put the motion, which on division was lost.

Hon Mr De Cosmos—When I first rose to address this House on the question of Confederation, I made some passing allusions to nation-making. Now, sir, I believe we are engaged in that great work. Our posterity will, I believe, control the northern end of this continent for a thousand generations. We find the American continent in the possession of two nations. The northern part in the possession of the Anglo-Saxon race and the southern part in the possession of the Spanish race. Then again we find the Anglo-Saxon race in the north divided into two nations with a great mission before them. The first object of the great nation to the south of us may, perhaps, be said to be the acquisition of territory, and they have a united piece of territory from our boundary to Mexico. With regard to the northern Anglo-Saxon race to which we belong, we find that they possess all to the north except Alaska. If the United States have a single and compact piece of territory to the south, we want the same in the north. Look at history as regards the acquisition of territory by nations: Lorraine by France, Poland by Russia, Scotland by England, Texas and Alaska by the United States. How has this been brought about but by a national policy. For hundreds of years it was the policy of France to acquire Lorraine; so it was with Russia and Poland. It has been said that republics cannot have a national policy as monarchies can; I say that they have a policy with regard to land. And I say that

we should have a policy of the same kind. Let us lay down this principle, that we need to create a great nation, and intending to do so we should have all territory north of the United States. I have no objection to the United States gaining territory to the south, but I do object to her coming north or holding Alaska. Let us glance at Alaska for one moment. The country is similar to our own. It has coal, fish and minerals as we have, and its contiguity to our country ought to induce us to believe that there is a natural alliance between us. We all know how much the purchase of this piece of territory cost the United States in hard cash. Then its annual cost is nearly two million dollars, or forty millions to support it as a United States territory for 25 years. Then look at the population, a mere nothing; and its revenue, hardly worth taking into account. It is said by many that America is sick of her bargain, and that Russia sold the United States. I think this is a favorable time to bring it up. Canada can well afford to pay for an extended frontier on the Pacific coast. If we purchased Alaska the Americans could still come in to fish and gather furs, so commercially there need be no difficulty. I believe we could get along smoothly, therefore I have to move this resolution:

"That Canada shall purchase the Territory of Alaska if possible."

I hope, sir, in all our relations for the future we shall remain international, not national.

Hon Dr Carrall—I rise to support the resolution of the hon Mr DeCosmos. The only objection I can see is that perhaps it is a little premature. That Canada will ultimately require it, I can have no doubt. In supposing that the acquisition of this territory, and the consequent hemming in of British Columbia, would have the effect of leading the people of Canada to be love in the ultimate destiny of the British American possessions being drawn into annexation or absorption, the hon W H Seward made an egregious blunder; he did it in his ignorance of the Canadian character. It is not necessary for Canadians to get up and show their loyalty daily, they are ready and able to occupy their position of IMPERIUM IN IMPERIO. There may be some people in Canada who do not like the government. In what country are there not some uneasy spirits? The United States has them, and England is not free from them. I shall decidedly support the hon member although, I think, he is perhaps a little in advance of American statesmen as to the acquisition of territory.

Hon Mr Humphreys—I think Mr Seward understood what he was about when he effected the purchase of Alaska. I feel convinced that the government of the United States will not consent to let us have it. I have a strong feeling in favor of the United States, and am satisfied that they should have Alaska. I don't think Canada can afford to re-purchase the territory; nor do I think she has men to pit against the intellectual giants of America. I think the hon member for Victoria District has perpetrated a joke on this Council; I shall, however, support his motion.

Hon Mr Ring—I rise to support the motion of the hon member for Victoria District.

Hon Mr Robson—I think this is a subject of too great importance to be disposed of hastily. It ought to be fully discussed. I agree with the hon member for Victoria District that such is desirable, but I also agree with the hon member for Cariboo that it is somewhat premature. I think the people of the United States would like to get rid of it, would be rather glad to back out of it. Their policy is to let it 'paddle its own canoe.' If we wait it will probably fall into our hands. If we are to make a suggestion as to the acquisition of territory we should not confine ourselves to Alaska only. Let us have Maine also. It impinges upon Canada on the Atlantic; and it is a portion of land out of which England allowed herself to be cheated. It is well known that Maine is most important as giving an open winter seaboard to Canada; a large portion of Canadian trade has had to pass through Maine in bond. I believe the Dominion of Canada will eventually utterly absorb America. (Laughter.) Some may laugh, but that is my conviction. The United States have made great progress, but the Constitution is very defective. It cannot bear the creation of another nation, especially one of such a liberal and enlightened constitution as the Dominion of Canada, alongside of it. One of two things is perfectly certain to my mind: that the Dominion will absorb the United States, or that they will meet as one nation, each giving up something. I think it is contrary to nature that they should continue separate. I believe that so great will be the success of the new British North American Empire, that it will absorb all the English speaking people on this continent. The people of Maine desire to belong to Canada, and have done so for years. If, on the Pacific, the Dominion acquires Alaska, and the State of Maine on the Atlantic, I assert that the great destiny of the Empire on is assured. I move that the State of Maine be included.

Hon Mr Humphreys—All we lack now is a Leech or Douglas Jerrold. I think we shall immortalize ourselves; probably we shall appear in Punch. I think Mr Seward won't blame us.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I must move an amendment. We shall be absorbed before this absorption can take place. I shall move to leave out the words 'if possible.' I think the frog has swollen to the size of an ox.

Hon Mr Robson—These debates should be carried on with becoming gravity.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I think so too, and I think it would be the duty of any Leech amongst us to secure a correct sketch of the movers of the resolution and amendments.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—I think the hon Attorney General should give his opinion.

The words "if possible," on vote, were struck out.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—Shall the words "State of Maine" be included?

Several members—Yes, yes.

The motion "That Canada shall purchase the Territory of Alaska and the State of Maine" was carried.

Hon Mr Humphreys—Mr Chairman, as there is no further resolution before the Committee except my own upon roads, I shall, without further words, move its adoption.

Hon Mr Barnard—I think it unwise to hamper these conditions, but I consider this an important question. I am here to protest on behalf of persons who pay road tolls. The excuse made for this imposition is that the colony is indebted for the construction of these roads. People have looked to Confederation to relieve them of the $4 per barrel duty upon flour, which they have been paying for so long. I desire to move an amendment to strike out the Douglas road, as I believe it to be unnecessary. I know that the upper country people will raise their voices against the continuance of the Road Tolls.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—The question was alluded to by myself when the terms were under discussion. I think the roads, if not national, ought to be local. I think the matter ought to be approached differently in dealing with this road. I think that shortly this plank in the platform of terms will be useless, because the railway will span the distance if Confederation is granted upon the terms proposed; therefore, I do not see the wisdom of handing them over to Canada. I think it desirable that road tolls should be abolished, and that we must have something to compensate us for giving them up.

Hon Attorney General—I cannot assent to either the original motion or the amendment. I premise by saying the matter has received considerable consideration. The original resolution, which was suggested by the Hon Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, took up his whole matter. I am sorry the House has not adjourned to give him an opportunity to explain his views upon this question. I [illegible] that the road from Yale to Cariboo would not be so well managed by the government at Ottawa as by the local government. The hon member for Yale says that there are no reasons for road tolls. There is one, as stated by the hon Chief Commissioner: it is being continually improved; therefore, a road of that description ought to carry with it a road toll for its construction and maintenance as a matter of principle, even after the original cost is paid.

Hon Mr Humphreys, with the consent of the House, withdrew his resolution in order to make some verbal alteration in it.

Hon Mr Barnard—I shall move the same amendment as I moved to the former resolution. I will read it:

"That the government be requested to insert in the terms of Confederation to be proposed to Canada some such clause as the following: All public roads and property of British Columbia at the time of admission to belong to British Columbia, except such public works and property as shall properly belong to the Dominion under the British North America Act; and such portions of the main trunk line through British Columbia or other roads then constructed as may be necessary to complete a continuous line of coach road from a point at or below Yale to a point at the foot of the eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, and that the same shall be free of toll of any kind whatever."

Hon Mr Ring—I agree that some road tolls ought to be kept up.

Hon Mr Humphreys—My only object is to bring this matter before the Executive. I cannot agree with the honorable member for Yale. I have not opposed any proposition of any man from personal motives.

Hon Mr Barnard—I oppose the motion of the honorable member for Lillooet. I think it does not meet the question.

Hon Attorney General—The objection to the whole matter in shape of a resolution is that by talking of road tolls we raise expectations we cannot probably fulfil. I had hoped honorable members would not press the subject. I assure the honorable gentleman that the petitions sent up have been the subject of earnest consideration. I attach weight to what the honorable member for Yale says in this House, and regret that such a feeling should go abroad.

Hon Dr Carrall—I, as member for Cariboo, should say something upon this matter. I have some doubt upon it. I would say this much as a member of the Government, that is, that many of their resolutions brought up here and vetoed will probably form the subject of negotiation with the delegation in settling the terms. They will be a sort of substratum. I regard the taxing of those who use roads as the proper means for the keeping up the road, and furthermore, I fear to overload the terms.

Hon Mr. Helmcken—For such roads as were made on the petition of the people tolls are justifiable, but tolls should not be kept up after the debt is defrayed. No doubt when this road comes under the rule of Canada she will construct turnpikes. Our road tolls are too high.

Hon Mr Robson—I regret the absence of the Hon Chief Commissioner. I think that he has an impression that some such resolution as this is necessary. I regret that the matter was brought up to day at all.

Hon Attorney General—I proposed that the matter should be left open until Monday.

Hon Mr Robson—Then let it be left open.

Hon Attorney General—I have pointed out the Hon Chief Commissioner's objections. He says that the road can be better kept up by the local than the Dominion Government. I regret the absence of the Hon Chief Commissioner. He did not state to me any certain impression, but I am sure he would have been glad to have joined in the discussion. It has, I have no objection to state, been discussed in Executive Council, and this discussion will do good. I must oppose such resolution going up to the Governor, for it may create expectations which, when the terms go to the polls, cannot be fulfilled.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—I have no doubt when the terms come to the polls there will be one howl of discontent at the financial part of them from Cariboo to New Westminster. I wish to see roads toll free, but I do not wish to see the Dominion Government taking charge of our local interests, such as tolls. With regard to terms, I say that the financial terms will kill confederation when it comes to the polls. The people from Cariboo to New Westminster want these road tolls abolished.

Hon Mr Robson—The Hon Attorney General suggests, on behalf of the hon Chief Commissioner, that we shall lose the revenue; but this is a gain if we get free from the maintenance of the roads. The Government should consider themselves part of the people, and endeavor to relax taxes. Another objection is, that under this arrangement roads would not be kept in repair so well as at present. I say, under Confederation the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works would have control of roads. The Dominion Government is less likely to be penurious than a local Government. The hon Chief Commissioner spoke to me after making that objection, and my distinct impression is that the hon gentleman would support some such proposition as this. We ask what is in perfect harmony with reason. We may just as well ask Canada to do the whole thing and to maintain the whole road.

Hon Mr Ring—It astonishes me that hon gentlemen are connecting revenue with these tolls. It can only be justifiable to keep tolls for the repair of roads.

Hon Dr Helmcken—I am on the horns of a dilemma. If I vote for road tolls, being taxable, I shall be told I want to make the terms too heavy; if against them, I shall be told I am against confederation.

Hon Mr Walkem—Sir: I have made few speeches during this debate, but this is a question on which I must ask leave to say a few words. Session after session the question has been brought down. We have had always a large Victoria element, and this question has, unfortunately, always taken a Victoria and Mainland issue. I have studied this matter carefully. With regard to the acts themselves they are very strong; they commence with preambles, as to construction, maintenance and repairs. The toll was not mentioned as to continue merely until the debt was extin-

ui-hed, therefore I think the vote should be taken on another view. The benefits accrue equally to Victoria and the upper country; properly the farmer gets the lion's share; I know the upper country pretty well; formerly the miner used nothing outside of bacon and flour. This should not be made an Island and Mainland question.

Hon Dr HELMCKEN—I do not regard the subject as a joke. We have paid $60 000 for roads on Vancouver Island—roads not one twentieth the length of those on the Mainland. Victoria gets more kicks than half pence. Victoria pays the greater part of the tolls. I belong to a company who pay a large proportion. What do they propose in place of a road toll? Some one must pay it. Thirty thousand dollars per annum is required to keep roads in repair. I say Victoria and Vancouver Island are more concerned with what is for the good of the colony, generally, than any part of the Mainland.

Hon MR HUMPHREYS—I rise to bear testimony to the fairness of the hon members for Vancouver Island in whatever concerns the Mainland. I have always seen a desire on the part of Vancouver Island members to legislate for the whole, and not for a part of the colony. I am as tired of this bickering as a member of the Mainland. I consider it our duty to be more united. If the hon members for New Westminster and Yale would talk less about injustice to the Mainland it would be better. I regret the action of the hon member for Yale, it is factious.

Hon Mr BARNARD—Vancouver Island has always made practical jokes of any questions from the Mainland.

Hon Mr DECOSMOS rose to order.

Hon Mr BARNARD—I referred to the hon gentleman for Victoria city. There are no road tolls on Vancouver Island. (Yes, a road tax!—hon Dr Helmcken.) As soon as the roads are paid for the people of the Mainland will, to a man, refuse to pay any more road tolls.

Every item has been used as a threat against confederation. I do not offer any such threat. I believe the upper country would accept confederation on the terms proposed. But if the Government expect that they will be able to collect this $60,000 from the population of the upper country they are mistaken.

Hon Mr DECOSMOS—The hon member for Yale is unjust to Vancouver Islanders. The whole of this colony is paying large sums of money for interest on debt on roads.

Hon Mr BARNARD—I did not say what I did with reference to Vancouver Island members without consideration.

Hon Mr ROBSON—I hope that Government members, in view of the absence of the hon Chief Commissioner, will vote so as to allow this resolution to go forward.

Hon ATTORNEY GENERAL—I must express a contrary hope.

The amendment of hon Mr Barnard was carried.

The Committee rose and reported the resolutions complete.

Council resumed and the resolutions passed in Committee were adopted except those with regard to the purchase of Alaska and the State of Maine.

### WEDNESDAY, 6th April.

The hon Attorney General, in the absence of the hon Colonial Secretary, Presiding Member.

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole, to take into consideration the message of His Excellency the Governor respecting the provision to be made for the sending of Delegates to Ottawa.

Hon Mr Ball in the Chair.

Hon COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—Sir, I rise to move,

"That suitable provision be made by this House for the payment of the expenses of the Delegates to be sent from this colony to Ottawa to negotiate the terms of the confederation of this colony with the Dominion of Canada."

This has been one of the preliminary steps taken by the other colonies before going into confederation. If it has been necessary in other cases, it is certainly necessary for us. The expense is comparatively small, probably from $2500 to $ 000, and the Governor has preferred to bring the matter before the Council now, instead of putting it into a supplementary estimate next session.

Hon MR RING—Sir, I beg to inquire why these resolutions cannot be transmitted by post. I do not see why the colony should be put to the expense of conveying the message, there is postal communication with Canada, and sufficient means of conveying to the Canadian Government what we have agreed upon. There can be no necessity to send hon members to Ottawa. The fact of our doing so would lead to the presumption that confederation is agreed upon. I differ in that. I say the people want to have the terms before them. Let us first see whether the colony assents to confederation in the abstract. Why should we send three or four hon and learned gentlemen—learned, no doubt. Why, I say, should we tax the colony, put to so much expense when it is in a state of poverty and bankruptcy. (No, no.) I say, dispatch the terms in the ordinary way by post.

Hon MR ROBSON—I hope, sir, it will not be necessary to fight our battles over again. This House has, in the name of the colony—(No, no, from hon Ring and Drake.) Perhaps it will suit some hon members better to say a majority of this House. (No, no.) Perhaps certain hon members will have the decency to be quiet until their turn comes to speak. A majority of this House, an overwhelming majority, has decided upon terms. We shall get the consent of the Canadian Government to these or modified conditions, and then submit them to the people. That is the only way. If we were, as proposed by the hon member for Nanaimo, to ask the people whether they wanted confederation, what would they say? (Mr Ring—They would say 'No!') They would say most emphatically, yes, on terms. They have said so for years. The Governor has adopted the usual course. These resolutions will go to the Canadian Government and come back, perhaps modified, and the people will then be asked if they will have confederation on these terms. The terms are now proposed to be sent to Ottawa. I cannot agree with the hon member for Nanaimo that it would be cheaper to send them by post. The first outlay might be smaller, but it might cause delay and, in my opinion, British Columbia cannot afford delay. The telegraph might do, but it would cost more. It ought to be by delegation. I think the House is entitled to know who are to go. I presume the Government will be prepared to give us the names. I, for one, would be unprepared to vote a sum of $2500, or more likely $5000, if I thought the Governor would send Delegates who would not be acceptable to the people. I say that the people ought to be represented, and that particular members who will fairly represent the people on the responsible government question ought to go. I say that if the Delegates are silent on responsible government, the Cabinet at Ottawa will raise it. If the Delegates say that British Columbia is not prepared for it, that it has been voted down, the Cabinet will say, because they have reason to believe that the people, or a large proportion of them, want it, and that they have had enough of discontent. I say that, although responsible government is not, strictly speaking, a condition it underlies and permeates the whole question.

Hon COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS—Nothing would be easier than to forward the resolutions by post to Canada. This has probably been done already; but in every one of the resolutions, as you all know, there are numerous points requiring explanations, and to make these effective the presence at Ottawa of Delegates on our part, understanding the question and authorised to act for us, would appear to be indispensable. I am inclined to think the the names of the Delegates are pretty well known, but I have no authority to mention them here. The governor has chosen them on his own responsibility, and he does not ask the Council to share that responsibility. For what purpose should the names be given? Does the Council wish to canvass the merits of each individual? What those gentlemen will say on the subject of responsible government I am not prepared to tell you, but I tell you this, that on that subject and on every other they will act with fairness and ability, with no discredit to themselves and with no discredit to us. I am ready at any rate to trust them so far as that. I hope this Council will trust them as the Governor has shown himself ready to trust them. Every year there are expenses that cannot be provided for except in the supplementary Estimates. This will doubtless be one of them. There will be no objectionable special tax, that I know of, proposed on this account. If there is, it will be time enough to oppose it when it comes. In the meantime you are asked simply to authorise the expenditure of a small sum of money for an object of infinite importance.

Hon MR HUMPHREYS—There is a mighty curious dust kicked up by great opposites when they meet. I think we shall see some of these gentlemen hoisted on their own petards. I have a pretty good idea who the gentlemen are, and I do not think they represent the people, especially in the matter of responsible government. I believe the Governor will act fairly and honorably, but I think he will not select men who will be acceptable to the people. My opinion is that the hon Chief Commissioner, the hon member for Victoria and the hon Attorney General do not represent the people. Popular members will be not one to themselves.

Hon MR DEWDNEY—The hon member has had his guess. I do not desire to mention names. I would merely suggest that His Excellency be requested to select one of the Delegates from the Mainland.

Hon CHIEF COMMISSIONER—My views on responsible government have been so often expressed that there is no occasion to refer to them again, but I am astonished that after hon members have told us that the people are a unit in favor of responsible government, they should be afraid to trust it to the people, or to the Council, which His Excellency has told you he will form after this Session. Why, then, are hon members so desirous to weight down the terms? Are they afraid that the people will not be so unanimous at the polls in favor of responsible government? His Excellency has told you that, if allowed by Her Majesty's Government, he proposes to form a Council which will be representative. I, for one have no doubt about the permission. The question will then be left to that Council. Why are hon members afraid to leave this question to the representatives of the people?

Hon MR HUMPHREYS—I will answer the hon Chief Commissioner; we are not afraid of putting the question before the people, but I am afraid that members of that delegation will misrepresent the opinions of the people to the Canadian Government; I fear the people will not be represented.

Hon MR DRAKE—Mr Chairman, I intend to oppose the resolution proposed by the hon Collector of Customs. I think that if hon members examine this message, in connection with His Excellency's speech, it is apparent that the resolution was sent down complete. This House was not allowed to alter them. The recommendations of hon members were voted down. I think it would be better to send the resolutions by post as the resolutions of government; they are not the resolutions of this committee.

Hon CHIEF COMMISSIONER—They are the resolutions of this House.

Hon MR DRAKE—No; only of the official majority. The expense is unnecessary; it is one which will be incurred to enforce the views of government. His Excellency asks that he should be authorized to expend a sum of money for this special purpose. A special tax is asked for. If we accede to this message we are assuming the responsibility. I would like to ask this question: Is the delegation to take powers from this House or from the government?

Hon CHIEF COMMISSIONER—I must reply without delay to one proposition. I would ask the hon gentleman to point out any one example of suggestion which, if defeated, was not defeated by a majority of, so-called, popular members, with the exception of responsible government, in which there was a majority of, so-called, representative members. The hon gentleman's remarks fall to the ground.

Hon MR HUMPHREYS—The mistake has been made at that end of the table. I think we are in duty bound to send delegates and raise the money. My only objection is that the names are withheld. I cannot understand why hon members should vote against this message. I believe we are all agreed that delegates should go, but if names are not sent down I must vote against it.

Hon MR DECOSMOS—Mr Chairman, I scarcely expected a discussion upon this point; I should have supposed that this House would have voted the money at once. The question is whether this delegation will be representative or not. I do not intend to offer any factious opposition. I am satisfied that the people will take means to send a people's delegation.

Hon MR BARNARD—I cannot support some of the gentlemen. The object of sending by delegates is that the terms may be modified if necessary. If unsatisfactory, will not the people have a right to say, 'How could we expect anything better?' Here are two members recent converts, and one a decided opponent. How can a popular member go to his constituents after voting this money. The people are in earnest in this matter. I stand on the floor of this House a government contractor, and likely to support the government; but so long as I give a straight vote on confederation my constituents cared not about anything else. On the Mainland we have been unanimous on confederation all through, and the Mainland is ignored. The two hon gentlemen at the head of the table represent the Island, and the other hon member represents the Island. The Mainland is not going to be satisfied, particularly when the hon senior member for Victoria, who has consistently opposed and will oppose Confederation, is to be one of the delegation. For the first time in twenty years the hon gentleman leaves this Island; he knows nothing about the interior of the country.

Hon MR DRAKE—The hon Chief Commissioner stated that the whole of the recommendations were carried, except one, by the majority of the popular vote. I instance free port and the telegraph to the contrary.

Hon Chief Commissioner—I must explain that I spoke from recollection. I was not in the House.

Hon Mr Robson—I claim that the official members who voted against responsible government must be struck out. But if we allow them to be counted, there is still a majority of six to three of the representative members in favor of responsible government; and I say that this resolution ought to be transmitted with such explanation as is necessary. With regard to responsible government being in the hands of the new Council, members will, we may presume, be elected for four years; consequently the question will, in all probability, be postponed for four years. And I say that those who keep back responsible government will run a great risk of having Confederation defeated at the polls. Some hon members may desire such a result. If so I can understand the course they are taking. With regard to the individuals going on the Delegation, if we are to take the general rumor there is not one who will properly represent the Mainland. There are two recent converts, and one open opponent of Confederation, an implacable and politically unprincipled enemy to Confederation, leagued with some power, I won't say with the cloven footed gentleman, but with some power to defeat Confederation. The people will not be satisfied. It is extraordinary that the Governor should make such a selection, ignoring the whole Confederation party and the whole Mainland as a territory. I could not justify myself if I voted for this resolution, which will virtually be voting for three Island members, two recent converts and one—(No, no! from Dr. Helmcken)—well, I won't say it again. (Laughter.) I can understand a Government disinclined at heart pursuing this course, but I cannot understand a Government that is true to the cause doing so.

Hon Chief Commissioner—Mr Chairman, hon members seem to be in position of fighting shadows in the dark. If they are wrong in their suppositions all the words that have been spoken to-day are thrown away. I fully concur in what fell from the hon Collector of Customs, that it is not proper that these names should be given. Hon members who favor confederation should be the last to object to the Governor's selecting members.

Hon Mr Robson have faith in the threats of his Excellency in the matter of confederation. The only act that shows me and other confederationists was the appointment of the hon member for Victoria city to the Executive Council. I believe his Excellency to be a confederate at heart. I will, in order to simplify matters, move to report progress, and ask leave to sit again, so that the Governor may have the opportunity of sending down names, or at all events, of satisfying the Mainland that their interests, and responsible government are cared for.

The motion to rise and report progress was lost

Hon Mr Hing—I think this debate, if it may be so called, is quite uncalled for and unnecessary. It is ridiculous to bring up the name of men who may possibly go to Ottawa and discuss them; it ought not to be allowed. It is waste of time and lungs. I had prepared a resolution that the terms should be sent by post, but I see that it would be vain to put it to the vote. If delegates go they ought to be properly equipped. I shall not, therefore, oppose the vote.

Hon Mr Dawbney—I agree with the hon member for Nanaimo that this debate is waste of time. I think the Mainland will be represented.

Hon Mr DeCosmos—I think it is not a question whether Island or Mainland is represented. We want the views of different parties represented, leaving out the Mainland and Island.

Hon Mr Robson—I express a hope that the Government will not press a Government vote.

Hon Attorney General—I can inform hon members that I feel perfectly satisfied that the Governor will not send down names. The hon member who names the delegates has better information than myself, the House having given unanimous adhesion to the terms. (No, no. I was the exception.—hon Mr DeCosmos.) at all events it was passed by a majority, and so becomes the act of the council. We could not expect Canada to send delegates here, they would be unable to refer to the Executive Council. It must injure the terms if in the debates of this House an expression of opinion goes forth to the world that the Governor has not Confederation truly at heart. The hon member for New Westminster says that I am a convert, and that I represent Victoria. I am glad that the old idea that I leaned too much to New Westminster is exploded. I should be sorry that it should run in the other direction. The hon member for New Westminster has told us we cannot get responsible government but he would not consent to make it a sine qua non.

Hon Mr Robson—I have never said that Confederation would be refused without responsible government.

Hon Attorney-General—I have no doubt, I am not speaking from positive knowledge, but I have no doubt that the delegates on this matter, if responsible government is started by the Canadian Cabinet, it will receive full consideration.

Hon Humphreys.—The people do not distrust His Excellency, but they do think that if certain members of the government are sent on this delegation they will endeavor to keep up the present system. I am satisfied that if the hon members named are sent Confederation is killed.

Hon Chief Commissioner said those who support Confederation are injuring the cause. I believe sir, that if a consistent supporter of confederation from the Island, and one from British Columbia are sent as the delegation, with one member of the Government, such a delegation would carry confidence even if the terms were modified. I propose to vote for this resolution. I hope the Delegates will be such as will give satisfaction. I contend that there are officials who would add weight to that delegation, and I should not like to see official members left out

On division the resolution was carried, only one vote being against it.

On motion of the Hon Chief Commissioner, Committee rose and reported resolution passed.

House adopted resolution.

*Reported for the Government by*

W. S. Sebright Green.